

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1852.

VOL. IV.—NO. V.

CYPRIAN.

Third Article.

CYPRIAN'S doctrine of the CHURCH we have found to be fundamental to his whole theology and religious life. In proportion as this is the case, it becomes important to understand well in what relation it stood to the faith and life of the Christian world generally in the first ages. To do justice to the man, as well as to judge properly of the doctrine, we must inquire how far this was peculiar to himself and to the time when he lived, or is to be regarded as having come down by legitimate inheritance and tradition from a still older period, as part of the faith which was supposed to have been originally delivered to the saints. To feel the full significance of such an inquiry, we need only to bring to mind distinctly the leading features of the Cyprianic doctrine of the church, and to observe at the same time the broad contrast and contradiction in which they may be seen at once to stand, with the thinking of a large portion of the modern so called evangelical world on the same subject.

What is most necessary to be kept in view in the Cyprianic
VOL. IV.—NO. V. 27

doctrine, is not this or that feature of it taken in a separate abstract light, the point of episcopacy for instance or the point of baptismal regeneration, but the universal idea rather, the conception of the church as a whole, out of which all such particular features flow, and in the presence and power of which alone they can be said to have any real force. The Campbellite Baptists, in their style, run away with the notion of an objective power of some sort belonging to the sacrament of baptism; and then claim to be what the church was in the beginning, by laying all stress on the ordinance in such view, as was done in primitive times. Their theory is, that the sacrament, as a Divine appointment, may be torn away from the living constitution to which it originally appertained, without losing its force, and so that the use of it by any class of men professing to obey the Gospel may be taken as sufficiently valid at all times for its original purposes and ends. The pedantry is much the same, it seems to us, when Episcopalians run away in similar style with mere episcopacy, or with the notion of a liturgy; and on the ground of such distinction simply pretend to be in union here with what the Church was in the first ages, with a certain affectation of exclusive completeness over against all other Protestant bodies which happen not to be possessed of the same advantage. What charm is there, we ask again as we have asked before, in a ministry of bishops, that it should be considered sufficient to bear away with it, wherever found, the original powers and prerogatives of the church, without regard to the whole constitution of the church as it stood in the beginning? Or what talismanic virtue for any such end shall be supposed to reside in the use of a liturgy, kept up in the same isolated way? We grant at once the argument for episcopacy drawn from the practice of the church in the third century; as we allow also the full force of the argument in the same form for the use of liturgies. Nothing short of the most bull-necked obstinacy, can refuse to see and admit what is so perfectly clear. In these points, separately viewed, Episcopalians undoubtedly come nearer to the Christianity of Cyprian's time, than the bodies they affect to exclude and condemn. We may say as much however of the Gospel according to Alexander Campbell. It approaches the primitive scheme of Christianity here and there, more closely than most of the sects which agree in denouncing it as rationalistic and false. And yet rightly no such advantage in this case, is allowed to be of any account; just because the resemblances rested upon show themselves to be not living but dead, are not rooted in the presence of the same life, but owe their

appearance altogether to outward artificial imitation. Mechanical similitude in this way is something widely different from organical communion. It is quite possible to conceive of an identity of life under great variations of outward form, while it may be wanting entirely where the outward show of variation is the least. No figure in wax can stand truly for the life it represents. No parts brought outwardly together can constitute a living whole. So in the case before us, we say, Episcopalians are quite too fast, when from the single fact of their agreement with the primitive church in the matter of episcopacy, and one or two other like separate points, they at once jump to the conclusion that they alone have preserved under a Protestant form the true succession of what Christianity was in the beginning, and that all other Protestant bodies are without authority and right. This, we are fully persuaded, is to bring the whole cause of Protestantism into peril. The question between those who receive and those who reject episcopacy on Protestant ground is a mere circumstance, over against the broad deep issue by which in the nature of the case both are sundered from the Church of Rome; and as related to this, it is a mere circumstance in the problem of making out for Protestantism a real historical derivation from the Christianity of the first ages. For one who is brought to understand the actual state of the case, it is easy enough to see that if Episcopalian Protestantism can be successfully justified in its measure of variation from the old order of the church, Protestantism without episcopacy also may be justified in the like general predicament; the difference in the degree of variation in the two cases being after all nearly as nothing, in comparison with what is of common amount. The grand question regards the right of Protestantism in its whole view. Has it been possible at all to maintain a true succession of the ancient church life, under this form? Let us feel only that an intelligent affirmative answer can be returned to this question, and we shall feel at the same time that the possibility cannot be held reasonably to the narrow limits of the Anglican scheme. To be of any real force that far, it must be of force still farther. By seeking to fix it within any such purely arbitrary and mechanical bounds, we in fact destroy it altogether.

The Cyprianic doctrine of the church made vast account indeed of episcopacy; but not of episcopacy in any and every view. The significance of the whole institution was conditioned by the universal scheme to which it belonged. It was felt to be of fundamental account in its organic relation to this scheme; while out of such connection it was held to be of no importance

whatever. What we need then to understand and keep in view, as we have said, is the conception or idea as a whole, which the doctrine before us exhibits as the true theory of the church. With regard to this, there is no room for any serious mistake. We may call in question, if we please, the truth of the theory. We may say that Cyprian and his age were in error. But the fact of the theory itself is too plain to be made the subject of any dispute, so far at least as its general form is concerned.

The theory is, that the Church was literally a Divine constitution, built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; that it grew out of the mystery of the Incarnation, and had its perpetual charter in the living power of the Apostolical Commission; that it bore thus the character of a true historical organization in the bosom of the world's present life; that under such outwardly visible and historical form, it carried in itself at the same time real heavenly and supernatural powers, actual virtue and force above nature for its own more than earthly and natural ends; that the exercise of these powers was through functions and organs ordained of God, and centering in the ministry of the episcopate, which was derived by clear succession from the office of the Apostles, and in the character of a solid corporation formed at once the basis and the bond of unity for the universal organism; and that there was no room consequently to think of salvation, except in the bosom of this most real system and through its instrumental mediation and help. It is easy to see, in such view, that all faith must start as an act of submission on the part of men to the authority with which they were supposed to be thus objectively confronted. Where a real constitution of this sort was allowed to be at hand, it is plain that no acknowledgment of Christianity could be regarded as true and valid, that fell short of an actual bowing of the soul to its claims in this form. Only to question these claims, to make them a matter for debate, was to refuse for the time the objective reality to which by Divine right they were taken to appertain. To talk of faith on the outside of the church was at once a contradiction in terms. No faith could be honest and sound, which was not ready to submit to the mystery which here challenged its submission. To believe, was of necessity thus to be also *baptized*, or in other words to come under the power in this real way of that real supernatural system, into the bosom of which baptism was considered always to be the solemn act of introduction, the sacrament of a new birth. And then we need be at no loss to understand the vast stress which was laid on the sin of schism.

With this theory of the church, it becomes at once an offence in full parallel with heresy, simply the obverse side in truth of that sin. It rests necessarily on the assumption, that there is no Holy Catholic Church, in the sense now under consideration—no real objective constitution, embodying in itself by Divine ordination the mystery of the Christian salvation under a supernatural form, and carrying in itself in such view the full guaranty of its proper infallible sufficiency for its own ends—and that Christianity therefore is by no means bound to any such order and method of revelation in the world, but may be carried into effect and made of force for the purposes of salvation, by the mere judgment and will of men, in some other form altogether. But who may not see, that for the doctrine before us every assumption of this sort, however tacitly and silently made, must be at once the negation of the whole fact of Christianity, the opposite exactly of all true faith? It strikes at the root of the whole mystery, which faith is required here to embrace; and in the bosom of which only as a Divine reality it can have any power to save. Schism then, in the very nature of the case, must be wholesale heresy also and death. It is the most fundamental of all forms of insurrection against the authority of the Gospel. It aims at its universal subversion.

Such, we say, is the Cyprianic doctrine of the church. Our modern Protestant scheme, it is painfully evident, is altogether different. The difference does not turn by any means on the question of episcopacy, or on any such point as purgatory, transubstantiation, or the worship of the saints. It lies deeper than all this. The true last ground of it opens upon us in the doctrine of the church. Protestantism, it is plain, involves an entire departure from the theory or scheme of Cyprian here, not simply as it may reject this or that form of ecclesiastical polity, this or that ecclesiastical usage, but as it refuses to see in the church the actual presence of the Christian salvation under the same outwardly real and objective view. Let no one take offence at this, as though it were a reproach cast upon Protestantism. We have to do with it at present only as a simple fact of history. As such, we are bound to see it, to acknowledge it, to make it the subject of earnest and solemn consideration. It is a fact which needs to be understood and satisfactorily explained, to make good our common boast that Protestantism seeks only the light.

So far as Puritanism is concerned, the difference now mentioned is immediately palpable. It openly repudiates the whole idea of the church, which is exhibited to us by Cyprian, con-

siders it a figment, part indeed of the mystery of iniquity, and something diametrically opposed to the notion of evangelical piety after its own approved style. It never grows tired of harping on the string, that to trust in the church is to have no proper sense of the spirituality of the Gospel, and that a religion of sacraments is puerile and unsafe. It sets Christianity on the outside of the church. This is not of the essence and constitution of the awful mystery in any way, but only an outward accident attached to it, which men may order and shape as they best can, with help of the Bible, to suit their own taste. The church is not the medium of the Christian salvation in any real sense. Faith stands not primarily in any act of submission to it in any such view; but has regard to truth under an altogether different form, and may be complete under a character of most perfect abstraction from its claims, and indeed must be so to make the acknowledgment of these claims afterwards, such as they are, of any actual account. Schism, on this scheme, becomes a very venial offence, is no longer at all intelligible indeed in its ancient sense. The universal sect system is based, of course, on the absolute want of everything like faith in the article of the Holy Catholic Church as it once stood; and the tendency of this system always is towards its own natural end of full Baptistical Independency, which boldly resolves the whole mystery into the notion of an indefinite multitude of churches formed by "social contract," in Jean Jacques Rousseau style, without the remotest imagination of any supernatural right or force whatever.

But the Puritan system in this case is not alone. The difference before us extends also, as already intimated, to Anglican Episcopalianism. Its theory of the church is not that of Cyprian. Whether right or wrong, this last makes no room for the legitimate entrance of any such fact as the Reformation, owns no possibility whatever of a valid hierarchy aside from the unity of the apostolical succession as a solid whole, and asserts with unflinching precision the presence of supernatural powers objectively at hand in the church and to be found nowhere else.

The difference is with Protestantism as a whole. It is not to be disguised, that this rests upon a doctrine of the church, which is broadly at variance with the doctrine of Cyprian. It becomes then a most interesting and momentous inquiry: *In what relation does this Cyprianic doctrine stand to the life and faith of the Christian world generally in the first ages?* The man who can be indifferent to the practical solemnity of this inquiry, may be very sure that he has himself no real faith in the Divine

realness of Christianity, but is mistaking for it always a hollow phantom only of his own brain.

May it be successfully pretended, in the first place, that Cyprian's doctrine was in any material view peculiar to himself, or that it gained ground and credit in the Christian world mainly through his authority and influence. This is a favorite fancy with some; and it receives a certain measure of countenance even from such a man as Neander. He talks of a gradual rise of hierarchical views by defection from the first simplicity of the Gospel, and sees in the schisms of Felicissimus and Novatian the last unsuccessful efforts of an older more free and spiritual tendency to maintain itself in opposition to this new movement, which was now bearing all in its own wrong direction. Cyprian, it is admitted, was not strictly the author of the movement; he found himself rather borne upon its bosom. But his personality fitted him to become beyond all other men of the time its representative and organ; and the supposition is accordingly, that it owed its triumph in the third century very largely to his active and uncompromising zeal. We have already seen however, to some extent, how little foundation there is for any hypothesis of this sort, in the actual facts of the age. The evidence is most ample and full, that Cyprian's doctrine of the church was, in all its essential features, the doctrine held in his time by the whole Christian world. East and West here were substantially of one and the same mind. Everywhere we find episcopacy, not only established, but acknowledged also to be of Divine right, by direct continuation down from the time of the Apostles. Along with this we find moreover, on all sides, the idea of the necessary unity of the church, the conception of its supernatural real constitution as an object of faith, in the sense of the Apostles' Creed, the acknowledgment of its essential relation to all true godliness, as being the body of Christ and so the medium through which he carries forward his glorious salvation in the world. Faith was held to stand primarily in this very habit of mind. It was obedience to the claims of the Christian fact, exhibited precisely in this outwardly objective and historical form. Hence baptism was owned to be regeneration; the eucharist was felt to involve the mystery of a real communication with the Saviour's flesh and blood; priestly absolution, following penance and confession, was relied upon as of true force for the remission of sin. Schism was regarded a deadly offence, just because it turned the fact of the Church into a lie, and was in this way a standing act of disobedience to the truth Divinely lodged in her constitution. We may set all

this down, if we see proper, for rank superstition ; but we can have no right to deny, that so at all events the faith of the Christian world stood in the third century, and that it was of one complexion thus with what we have found to be the general church system of Cyprian. Christianity, as it then prevailed, was conditioned absolutely and essentially by this system. The church was made to be the pillar and ground of the universal fact. We see this, not merely in the direct statements which are made on the subject, but in some respects more impressively still in forms of thought and life by which in an indirect way it is continually taken for granted. The doctrine is not met in the form of an outward accident only ; we find it wrought into the whole religious mind of the age ; it is of one growth with this, concrete with its very existence, we might almost say, at every point. It is implied in the controversy concerning the restoration of the lapsed. It lies in all the premises, which entered into the reigning system of church discipline, in the eagerness of penitents to secure the peace of the church, in the forms and rules which governed its mysterious communication. It formed the soul of the question concerning the baptism of heretics. It lay at the foundation of the views which were entertained of the vast merit of martyrdom, of the communion of saints, of the power of the holy sacraments, and we may say indeed of the universal theology of the age. All is constructed on the assumption of the Divine constitution of the Church, under such form of objective reality as we have now in consideration. Cyprian's writings are everywhere an appeal to this fact. He deals in no speculation ; brings in no theory of his own ; but throws himself perpetually on what he holds to be the living sense of Christianity, in the consciousness of that world of faith generally to which the mystery belonged. And this precisely it was, that clothed his writings with power. They came home to the heart and mind of the church, as an echo for the most part of its universally acknowledged faith.

But such a faith thus universally established in the middle of the third century, could not have sprung up like a mushroom in the night, could not have been the growth of a single day or year. It creates of itself at once a mighty presumption, that it had come down by general tradition from the time going before ; and if there be no clear evidence to the contrary, this tradition or handing down must be taken to reach away back to the earliest date of ecclesiastical history. It is asking a great deal too much, in such a case, when we are required to set out with just the opposite presumption ; and are gravely told that, not the fact

of variation here, but the fact of identity, is that which needs to be made out at every upward step of such inquiry by direct overwhelming proof. The only truly logical and philosophical view is that which takes the sameness for granted, till the fact of some actual change is demonstrated. Such a state of things as we meet with, throughout the length and breadth of the Christian world, in the time of Cyprian, whose own life reached back to the beginning of the century, and who stood in such close theological relation with Tertullian, the great connecting link between the third century and the second, most conclusively implies that substantially the same order of thought and life had prevailed also in this earlier period. It is not possible to account satisfactorily for the later known fact on any other hypothesis. And more especially must this be felt to be the case, when it is borne in mind that the authority of such a tradition, in favor of the later system, was always boldly asserted, and that so far as we know the assertion never met with contradiction in any quarter. For even Neander has not pretended to say, that either Novatian or Felicissimus ever appealed to any older doctrine or practice, as being in opposition to the high church pretensions by which they were resisted in their schismatical designs; as they would have done certainly in their own defence, if the thing had been at all possible; and it seems to us therefore to be no better than the most puerile romance, when the great historian chooses to make their factions notwithstanding, especially that of the last, the representation of a hypothetical anti-hierarchical interest in the church, which with the advantage of antiquity and right religious feeling on its side, was no longer able now to maintain its ground. So far as episcopacy was concerned, the tradition of which we now speak carried it back distinctly, as we have before said, to the age of the Apostles. The bishops were held to be their successors in office, the bearers of the same commission which these had received in the beginning to teach all nations; and the line of this succession, in the case of the different sees, was in fact traced up to the very time when they were first established; a task, which was then just as easy as it would be now to carry back the succession of any well established civil magistracy for a like comparatively short period of years.

But we are not left to this form of proof alone, strong as it must be allowed to be in the full posture of the case. We can appeal directly to the voice of the second century itself.

All the writers of this period speak familiarly of the government of the church by bishops, who were regarded as holding

their office by legitimate succession from the Apostles. Tertullian and Irenaeus, in controversy with the heretics of their time, appeal to the course of this succession in the case of certain prominent sees as an open clearly established fact, which could be verified for any inquirer without the least difficulty or trouble. And what right can any one have now, to call in question the credibility of their statement, or to suppose that it was founded on some sort of mistake? It would be just as reasonable to question an appeal, at the present time, to the Gubernatorial succession of Pennsylvania, or Massachusetts, or New-York, since the date of the American Revolution, in proof of the historical identity of the government of either of these notable Commonwealths between the years 1776 and 1852. There was just as little room for uncertainty in the one case as in the other. "Come then," says Tertullian in his celebrated tract on *Prescription*, "you who wish to exercise your curiosity to more advantage in the affair of salvation, go through the apostolic churches, in which the very chairs of the apostles continue aloft in their places, in which their very original letters are recited, sounding forth the voice and representing the countenance of each one. Is Achaia near you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedon, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you can go to Asia, you have Ephesus. If you are near Italy, you have Rome, whence we also derive our origin. How happy is this church, to which the apostles poured forth their whole doctrine with their blood! where Peter is assimilated to the Lord in his martyrdom: where Paul is crowned with a death like that of John: where John the apostle, after he had been dipped in boiling oil without suffering injury, is banished to the island: let us see what she learned, what she taught, what she professed in her symbol in common with the African churches" (c. 36). The heretics are boldly challenged to produce any similar warrant for their pretensions. "Let them then give us the origin of their churches; let them unfold the series of their bishops, [they too, it seems, knew of no other form of church polity,] coming down from the beginning in succession, so that the first bishop shall appear to have been appointed and preceded by some one of the apostles or apostolic men, without having fallen off subsequently from their communion. For in this way the apostolic churches trace their descent; as the church of Smyrna, for instance, refers to Polycarp constituted by John, and the church of the Romans to Clement ordained by Peter. In like manner also the other churches show those who were appointed to the episcopate by the apostles, and so

made channels of the apostolic seed. Let the heretics feign anything like this" (c. 32). Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, had argued against the false teachers of his time in precisely the same strain. "All who wish to see the truth," he says, "may see in the entire Church the tradition of the apostles, manifested throughout the whole world; and we can enumerate the bishops who have been ordained by the apostles, and their successors down to our time, who taught or knew no such doctrine as they madly dream of. But since it would be very tedious to enumerate in this work the succession of all the churches, by pointing to the tradition of the greatest and most ancient church, known to all, founded and established at Rome by the two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, and to her faith announced to men which comes down to us also by the succession of bishops, we confound all those who in any improper manner gather together, either through self-complacency, or vain-glory, or blindness and perverse disposition. For with this church, on account of her more powerful principality, it is necessary that every church, that is the faithful on all sides round, should agree, in which the apostolic tradition has been always preserved by those on all sides" (l. iii. c. 3). No one needs to be informed of the doctrine of Ignatius on the same subject, which itself sets us almost in felt contact with the last of the Apostles. His glorification of episcopacy, as the ground of all stability and the channel of all grace in the church, is an old topic, familiar to all who have bestowed on the Episcopalian controversy of modern times even the least attention. The very fulness and force of his testimony are made, by those who cannot bear it, a reason for disputing its truth. Their own foregone conclusion would be at once upset by its clear distinct voice; and so, to save their conclusion, they set themselves to smother the voice as they best can, by taking it for granted that it is surreptitious and false, something palmed upon the real Ignatius by the pious fraud of a later age. Professor Rothe, in his great work *Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*, has well exposed the arbitrary and absurd character of this wholesale scepticism. The truth is the Episcopal passages of Ignatius, as they may be called, have not as such the slightest air of forgery or interpolation; they fall in naturally and easily with his general train of thought, and stand in close connection with the whole form and habit of his theology. This will be shown presently, when we come to consider more particularly the view he takes of the Church. And just as little room is there to say, that the style of thinking here brought into view does not agree with the age of Ignatius, but

is made to anticipate unnaturally what belongs of right only to the next century. It is easy to see, that it is not identical in any such way with the thinking of this later time, that it bears upon it the marks of an earlier stage of the Christian life, and that it fits well with the ecclesiastical and theological connections of the period to which it is thus referred, so far as we have any knowledge of them from other sources. The Epistles of Ignatius, in their generally accepted form, are just such a light in truth as we need to find our way in ecclesiastical history, with any sort of intelligence, from the first century over into the bosom of the second, from the age of the Apostles onward to the order of things which stares us in the face in the days of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Extinguish this light, refuse to acknowledge what it reveals, violently *theorize* into the place of this another scheme of church facts altogether; and it is not too much to say, that the whole history of the second century must be brought at the same time into inextricable confusion.

We are not concerned particularly at present, however, with the question of Episcopacy. It is plain enough, that the government of the church, in the second century, was in this form; and we think it sufficiently clear also, that the See of Rome was regarded as possessing a central dignity in the system, a sort of actual *principality*, derived from the original primacy of St. Peter. But for our main purpose just now, this is of only secondary account. What we seek, is to determine the view taken of the constitution of the Church itself inwardly considered. This is something back of all questions concerning its outward polity, even though such polity be regarded as Divine, and as essentially blended thus with the very existence of the organization to which it may belong. Waiving then the abstract controversy between Presbytery as such and Prelacy, as well as that between both of these together and the Papacy, we go on to show that the second century throughout held the same view of the general nature and constitution of the Church, which we have already found to underlie the scheme of Cyprian in the third. According to this view, the Church is a supernatural fact in the world under an outward historical form, a real constitution established by extraordinary Divine commission and destined to endure to the end of time, with powers and functions answerable to such high character. It grows at the same time with inward necessity, from the mystery of the Saviour's incarnation, including his resurrection and glorification, according to the order exhibited in the Apostles' Creed. In such view, it is the actual home of the grace and truth here brought to light for

the salvation of dying men, not an external accident simply of Christianity, but a fundamental part of its very constitution, the medium by which it is made actual, the body through which as an organ it works, in the world. Submission to this outwardly real constitution is the true obedience of faith, in which all salvation begins, and baptism as a true objective response to such act of submission is a sacrament of regeneration introducing the subject into the heavenly order of life to which it belongs, and giving him a title to all its privileges, with the full real possibility of eternal salvation. So constituted, the Church is necessarily one, and catholic, and holy, and apostolic, carrying in it the positive whole of Christianity, and absolutely excluding as false and profane all that is external to its own communion. Schism becomes thus at once a mortal sin, of one nature with heresy; to be out of the church is to be cut off from the fountains of salvation in every other form; the bible, the sacraments, the ministry, are streams of life only within this mystical paradise, not on the outside of it; no one can have God for his father, who has not this visible and actual Church for his mother. Such, we say, is the general theory. We are not presenting it now as necessarily right and true. We propose only to show, that it was universally held in the second century.

The truth is, however, it is not easy to know where to begin with the evidence, or how to arrange it, just because it is so abundant and full. So soon as we lay aside all stubborn preconceptions, and endeavor simply to take the age on its own standpoint, we shall find that its whole theological life is constructed on the basis precisely of the scheme now stated, and that its utterances become clear and intelligible only in proportion as we make it a key for their interpretation. To understand Tertullian, Irenaeus, or Ignatius, to be able to read their writings, with any true religious interest or satisfaction, the most indispensable of all conditions is just that we should have power to perceive this fact, and power at the same time to make ourselves at home—hypothetically at least if not by conviction of its truth—in the animus of their faith as exercised in such intensely realistic style.

On the apostolicity of the church, its Divine commission, the realness of its constitution as a fact handed down by unbroken continuous succession from the beginning, Tertullian's tract in particular on the Prescription of Heretics might be given at large. He puts down all heresies, by asserting in favor of the church the right of possession and regular inheritance, over against which every later claim must be held at once for a false

and unlawful usurpation. Christ, he tells us, who knew his own doctrine, chose twelve of his leading disciples to be the teachers of it to the nations. "These apostles, whose name signifies *sent* . . . having obtained the promised power of the Holy Ghost for miracles and speech, and having preached the faith and established churches first in Judea, afterwards went forth into the world at large and proclaimed the same teaching of the same faith to the nations; and then they founded churches in every city from which other churches afterwards borrowed the graft of faith and seed of doctrine, and are continually doing so still in order to become churches. And in this way these also are reckoned apostolical, as being the progeny of apostolical churches. Every kind must of course be referred to its origin. Hence however many churches there may be, that which was first from the apostles is one, of which come all. Thus all are the first and apostolical, whilst all as one show their unity, by communication of peace, and title of brotherhood and mutual pledge of hospitality; rights, which no other reason regulates save one tradition of the same sacrament. From this then we draw the prescription: that if our Lord Jesus Christ sent apostles to preach, no other preachers are to be received than those whom he commissioned, because no other has known the Father but the Son and he to whom the Son has revealed him, and to no others does the Son appear to have made such revelation but to the apostles, whom he sent to preach of course what he revealed. But what they preached, that is, what Christ revealed to them, I will here also lay down the rule, ought not to be proved otherwise than by the same churches, which the apostles themselves founded, by preaching to them with the living voice as they call it, as well as afterwards by their letters. If these things be so, it is clear thence that all doctrine which agrees with those apostolical churches, the matrices and originals of the faith, is to be reckoned as true, exhibiting without doubt what the churches received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; but that all other doctrine is to be fore-judged as false, the taste of which is against the truth of the churches, and of the apostles, and of Christ, and of God. It remains then that we show, whether our doctrine, whose rule we have already given, is to be reckoned of apostolical tradition, and from this itself whether all besides must be referred to falsehood. We communicate with the apostolical churches, which is done by no different doctrine: this is the test of truth" (c. 20, 21). This passage brings into view also Tertullian's idea of the necessary unity of the church. However many particular

churches there may be, they are all in truth one by virtue of their common apostolical origin and life. Each one is what it professes to be, in the bosom only of the general organization of which it is thus a part. So in other places, he speaks of such churches as bound together, in distinction from all heretical assemblies, by a common "right of peace and title of brotherhood;" they have "one faith, one God, the same Christ, the same hope, the same sacramental laver." What belongs to one belongs to all; "nostrum est quodcunque nostrorum est." They are all "confederated by sacramental association" (*de societate sacramenti confoederantur*). Unity implies exclusiveness, in other words the restriction of the Christian salvation to the church, as being its real medium and organ. This thought also is familiar to Tertullian. He lays stress on the maternity of church; and makes use of the subsequently classic symbol of Noah's ark, to express its relation to the surrounding world.

On all these points, the still older testimony of Irenaeus is yet more explicit and direct, as well as far more large and full. He too puts down the cause of all heretics by the plea of prescription, original occupancy and prior right on the part of the church, which he views always as a single corporation, in full unity with itself and of unbroken succession from the time of the apostles. The church is universal, "diffused through the whole world to the ends of the earth." As such again it is exclusive, allowing no rivalry with its proper functions under any different form. He sees in it always the definite and only channel of the historical progress of the work of redemption, the only organ of Christ's redeeming activity in the world, the only possessor of the powers of the Christian salvation, that is, in one word, of the Holy Ghost. Here alone are deposited all the treasures of grace; and here accordingly they are, at the same time, in absolutely full measure. In the church only is to be found the complete truth. She is the only possessor and guardian of the true holy scriptures. She is, in the most manifold relations, the mother, and the only mother, of all who belong to Christ. To be out of her bosom, by heresy or schism, is death. In the remarkable passage, *Adv. Haer.* i. iii. c. 24, §. 1, he speaks of the whole economy of the Gospel, as an objective system set forth everywhere under the same form, which we comprehend in our faith, as we receive this to keep from the church, where the Spirit of God always resides, like some rich unguent in a good vessel, "*juvenescens et juvenescere faciens ipsum vas in quo est,*" the source of a perennially new and fresh life. "For this gift of God is bestowed upon the church, like the breath of

life to the natural man, that all the members by partaking of it may be made alive; and in her is arranged the communication of Christ, that is the Holy Ghost, the pledge of incorruption, and the confirmation of our faith, and the scale of ascension to God. For in the church, it is said, God has placed apostles, prophets, teachers, and every other operation of the Spirit; of which all fail to partake, who have not recourse to the church, but cheat themselves of life by wrong judgment and pernicious work. For where the church is, there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the church and all grace; but the Spirit is truth. Wherefore such as fail to partake of him are neither nourished by the breasts of the mother into life, nor participate in the most pure fountain that proceeds from the body of Christ, but dig out for themselves broken cisterns of the earth, and drink water filled with mud, avoiding the faith of the church so as not to be converted, and rejecting the Spirit so as not to be amended." Again, l. v. c. 20. §. 2: "We must then flee the opinions of heretics, and carefully watch against their infestations; but must take refuge in the church, and be educated in her bosom and nourished by the Lord's scriptures. For the church is planted as a paradise or garden in this world. So of every tree of the garden ye shall eat, saith the Spirit of God, that is, eat ye of every scripture of the Lord; but ye shall not eat of knowledge pretending to be above this, nor touch the whole dissent of heretics. For they themselves avow, that they have the knowledge of good and evil, and set up their impious sense above God who made them. They think thus above the measure of thought. Wherefore also the Apostle says, we must not think more highly than we ought to think, but should think soberly; that we may not, by eating of their knowledge, that namely which is thus too high, be thrust out from the paradise of life, into which the Lord brings those who obey his command, 'gathering together in one all things in himself both which are in heaven and which are on earth.' But what is in heaven are spiritual things, what is on earth is the economy of man. Gathering these into one therefore in himself, uniting man to the Spirit and placing the Spirit in man; he has become the head of the Spirit, and gives the Spirit to be the head of man: for through him we see, and have heard and do speak." So again, l. iii. c. 4, §. 1: "It is not necessary to seek from others the truth which it is so easy to receive from the church, since the apostles have most fully committed to her, as a rich depository, all that is of the truth, that every one who will may take thence the water of life. For

she is the entrance into life, while all others are thieves and robbers. On which account, we are to shun them, and to regard with diligent affection what is of the church, holding fast the tradition of truth." On the unity of the church, the same writer, as is well known to all who have any knowledge of him, is particularly clear and emphatic. He makes it to consist in identity of doctrine and confession, in community of faith, in the participation of the same Holy Ghost, and expressly also in the power of a common ecclesiastical organization, held together by the general bond of the episcopate in its collective or consolidated view. "Though spread over the whole world to the ends of the earth, the church still holds one faith received from the apostles and their disciples. . . . This proclamation and this creed so received, she sedulously guards, notwithstanding her diffusion throughout the world, as if she occupied but one house; she believes them alike as if she had one soul and the same heart, and harmoniously proclaims and teaches them, and hands them down, as though she were possessed of but a single voice. The dialects, as regards the world, are indeed different; but the force of the tradition is one and the same. . . . For as the sun, God's creature, is through the whole world one and the same, so also the proclamation of the truth shines in every direction, and enlightens all men who are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth" Adv. Haer. I. 10, §. 1, 2.—"Wherefore it is necessary to hearken to the presbyters in the church, to those who have the succession from the apostles, as we have shown, who along with the succession of the episcopate have received the sure gift of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father; while all others, who stand aside from the reigning succession, and convene together in any place, are to be held in suspicion, either as heretics of bad doctrine, or as proud and self-pleasing schismatics, or finally as hypocrites actuated by the desire of gain and vain glory. All such are fallen from the truth. . . . From all such therefore it is a duty to abstain, but to adhere to those, who both keep the doctrine of the apostles, as we have said before, and along with the order of the eldership exhibit sound speech and a life without offence for the confirmation and reproof of others" Ib. iv. c. 20, §. 2, 4. The true Christian *gnosis* is represented as resting, iv. c. 33, §. 8, in two elements, the doctrine of the apostles and the church system derived from them, by episcopal succession, throughout the world. "*Agnitio vera est apostolorum doctrina et antiquus ecclesiae status in universo mundo et character corporis Christi*" VOL. IV.—NO. V.

secundum successiones episcoporum, quibus illi eam, quae in uno quoque loco est, ecclesiam tradiderunt."

How deeply seated this whole view of the unity and exclusiveness of the church was in the faith of this early time, is strikingly shown in the usual mode of denouncing heretics and heresies. The two conceptions of heresy and schism are always regarded as flowing more or less together. The error of judgment is always taken to be something, that grows out of an evil heart of disobedience towards an actual teaching authority, which all are required at once to acknowledge and obey. The truth as it is in Christ is never viewed as the sense simply of a written revelation, which men are expected to understand as they best can and so set up as an object of faith. It is primarily a *tradition*, a system handed down from the apostles under a tangible objective form, in the bosom of a constitution which is itself part of the revelation, and which challenges to itself the homage and submission of all in such view, as the indispensable condition of their having any lot or part in the grace which is thus placed within their reach. It is continually taken for granted, that this outward authority is clearly defined and constantly at hand, so as to leave no apology or excuse for falling into heresy in any form. Heretics are necessarily and at once rebels against a regularly constituted authority, which they are bound to obey; and this rebellion, in the circumstances, amounts to a virtual renunciation of the Divine supremacy of Christianity itself. It involves the guilt of schism, rupture with the evangelical tradition, a violent breaking away from the actual living order of the Gospel; and this, of course, can be nothing less in the end than down right infidelity. Such, we say, is the light in which it is regarded and spoken of always by the early fathers. We have seen already how Tertullian and Irenaeus make use of the argument from prescription. They put down all heresies as innovations and invasions upon long established right. The church is in actual possession of the truth; it belongs to her by inheritance; her title deeds reach back plainly to the original charter of Christianity. What right then can any other party have, to come in and dispute her authority? Heresy is, by its very conception, the setting up of mere private will against law and right. It expresses precisely the opposite of the attribute *catholic*, as this enters necessarily into the constitution of the real and true church. It carries in it at once the notion of sect, something cut off from the proper whole of Christianity, the substitution of what is private and subjective, matter of wil-

ful choice, ἀπορίαι, for what is objective and general.¹ All such particularism, in the sphere of Christianity, must be irreligious, a work of the flesh (Gal. v : 20), a virtual denial and abandonment of the faith. The heretic is to be considered αὐτοκατάκριτος, self condemned (Tit. iii : 10, 11); as one who voluntarily disowns and gives up the Christian principle, the fundamental maxim of the obedience of faith. He is condemned, says Tertullian, "in quo sibi elegit," by the matter of his own election. "We have no right," he adds, "to bring in anything of our own will, nor yet to choose what any one else may have brought in of his mere will" (De Praesc. c. 6). That is his notion of religious liberty and private judgment; which he backs by the authority of our Lord's apostles; for even they, he tells us, did not choose what they should teach, but "faithfully delivered to the nations the discipline they had received from Christ." Heresies are in this way always the fruit of the fleshly mind as such, acting in opposition to the mind of the Spirit. "Wo to those," cries Origen, "who despise the church, and trust in the arrogance and swelling words of heretics." There are three habits of the soul, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, ignorance, opinion, knowledge; the first is that of the heathen, the last belongs to the true church, while the character of heresy is found in the second. It puts the merely subjective into the room of the objective, mistakes its own fancies for heavenly realities. Christianity in this form ceased to be a church, and became a school. The attributes belonging to it as the body of Christ, were lost in the narrow conception of mere human party or sect. This is often held up by the early fathers in the way of reproach. Heretics, according to Tertullian, seemed to have no sense at all for unity or catholicity; and just for this reason, they were uncommonly liberal and tolerant, planting themselves on the ground that there should be free inquiry in religion, and liberty also to change opinion as often as it might be found necessary. "They join peace on all sides," says Tertullian, "and make no account of their own differences, whilst they band themselves together to make war upon the one truth." "They can hardly be said to have any schisms; because when they exist, they come not into view. Schism is their unity. They do not even adhere among themselves to their own systems, but

¹ So Athanasius: Πάντες λέγουσιν αἰρετικὸς; Ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰρετοῦς τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ τοῦτο ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.—So Tertullian: Haereses dictae graeca voce ex interpretatione electionis, qua quis, sive ad instituendas sive ad suscipiendas eas, utitur.

every one modifies by private judgment what he has received, just as this was concocted by private judgment on the part of his teacher. The course the thing takes tells its nature and the manner of its commencement. The Valentinians have as much sight as Valentinus, the Marcionites as much as Marcion, to alter the faith at their own pleasure. And so all heresies, when carefully examined, are found to disagree in many things with their authors" (De Praesc. c. 41, 42). They showed a common tendency, according to the Apostolical Constitutions, vi: 10, to treat religious differences as of no material account. They affected to care only for practical piety. They laid great stress on following the Scriptures; and were fond of appealing to such texts as, "Seek, and ye shall find," "Prove all things, &c.," in justification of their restless unsettled habit. "They are forever pretending to seek," says Irenaeus, "as persons without sight, but are never able to find." All with them is matter of opinion; whereas the idea of faith requires something fixed and sure, in the way of outward objective tradition, that may be submitted to in such view as the firm ground of the Christian life.

Holding such relation to the Catholic Church, heresies are condemned always in the most unsparing terms. By no possibility can they be either safe or right. It is common to refer them directly to the instigation of the Devil. "Heretics are all apostates from the truth," according to Irenaeus, Adv. haer. iv: 26, §. 2; "and as they offer strange fire on the altar of God, that is strange doctrines, they shall be consumed by fire from heaven, like Nadab and Abihu. As rising up against the truth, and exhorting others against the church, they abide in hell, swallowed up of the opening earth, like the company of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. As dividing and separating the church, they fall into the punishment of Jeroboam." Origen on Rom. xiv: 22, 23, *Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God, &c.*, proceeds in the following strain: "Some one may ask, if heretics also, because they act according to what they believe, may be supposed to act from faith. In my view, we should call it their credulity rather than faith. For as false prophets are sometimes improperly called prophets, and false science is said to be science, and false wisdom is termed wisdom; so the credulity of heretics is by a false name designated faith. Whence it is to be considered, whether even if any good work may seem to have place among them, it is not perhaps converted into sin, as it is said of one, *Let his prayer be turned into sin*. There is a chastity at times, which is not of faith, &c., &c. There is thus a false faith of such as *concerning faith have made ship-*

wreck, there is a false wisdom also of this world and of the princes of this world, which shall be destroyed. For as pirates are accustomed to kindle a fire under cover of night, near shallow and rocky parts of the sea, by which they may draw mariners, through hope of reaching a safe haven, into ruinous shipwreck; so also is that light of false wisdom or false faith kindled by the princes of the world and the powers of the air, not that men may escape, but that they may perish, in their voyage on the sea of life and through the waves of this present world."

What we need to observe, is the opposition in which heresy is made to stand to the idea of the church, as something individual and private, in the form of opinion or speculation, over against an authority which is assumed to be at hand under the character of a known positive constitution, demanding submission not as a matter of opinion but as an act of faith. The sense of this opposition, and this particular conception of the nature of faith, may be said to enter into the universal thinking of the ancient church, and come into view more or less clearly wherever the subject of heresy is brought in any way under consideration.

What Irenaeus relates of Polycarp, and his well known story concerning St. John, falls in exactly with this habit of thought, and must be taken as a true picture here at all events of the mind of the first half of the second century, whatever may be made of the story in question; which itself, however, would seem to be open to no reasonable doubt. Polycarp, we are told, during his visit to Rome in the time of Anicetus, converted many heretics to the church, by simply announcing the truth he had been accustomed to teach in Asia as having been received and delivered to him by the Apostles. "And there are those," Irenaeus adds, "who have heard him say, that John, the disciple of the Lord, having entered a bathing house in Ephesus, when he learned that Cerinthus was also within, hastened out of the place before he had washed, saying he feared the building might fall having Cerinthus in it, the enemy of the truth. Polycarp himself also, when Marcion once met him and asked, *Dost thou know us?* replied, *I do know thee as the first born of Satan.* Such fear had the Apostles and their disciples of communicating, even to a word, with any of those who corrupted the truth."

The whole thinking of this early period, we say, is based upon the idea of the church which we have now under consideration. No quotation in regard to particular points can do the subject any sort of justice. There is danger rather of their

serving to enfeeble the argument they should support, by their necessarily partial character and isolated form. Their full proper force can be felt only in the bosom of the living connections, from the midst of which they are taken. To understand the theology or worship of the primitive church, as it comes before us in the most ancient fathers, at almost any point, we must be able to throw our minds into the posture of this idea, and to conceive of the church, hypothetically at least, as a Divine constitution, embodying in itself in a real way the powers of the Christian salvation, "the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Take, for example, the single point of baptismal regeneration. No thought is more familiar to this early Christianity, than that baptism is of force really and truly for the remission of sins, and to bring men into saving relation with God. It is spoken of continually as an illuminating, cleansing, renovating sacrament. It is made everywhere to be the basis and foundation of the Christian life. All this too, without the least sign of hesitation or embarrassment, in the most ready and matter of course style, as though the point were open to no difficulty and understood all round to be a first principle of the doctrine of Christ. To say, that such phraseology was mere rhetoric, or flourish of high sounding words known to be hollow figure and falsehood at last, is an insult on the ancient church worthy only the pen of Gibbon or the tongue of Voltaire. It simply shows, what earnest was then made with the objective realness of the church. Suppose Christianity a doctrine only, a simply spiritualistic system in the modern Puritan or Methodistic sense, and then indeed all such phraseology becomes more or less unmeaning bombast, the credit of which can be saved only by such violent qualification as must turn the whole of it at last into frigid nonsense. But suppose only the actual presence of righteousness and salvation in the church, as a known outward and historical corporation, the full possibility of redemption brought home *there* to all who can be led to believe and embrace the joyful intelligence, and who may not see that the difficulty of all these startling forms of speech is at once brought comparatively to an end? In proportion precisely as this view can be reproduced in any modern mind in a lively way, it will be found to carry in it all the key that is needed, to solve the otherwise inexplicable enigma of the old ecclesiastical *usus loquendi*, on the subject of holy baptism. And so with regard to other points. All are conditioned by faith in the article of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, as being the spouse of God, the mother of saints, the real medium of salvation and fountain of life to a dying world. That is the

universal standpoint of Christian antiquity; and to understand it, or do it any sort of justice, we must be able, both in mind and heart, to *think* ourselves into the same position. With regard to this whole subject, there is too much reason to apprehend, antiquity might say to most of us, as St. Paul says to the Corinthians: "Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own bowels!"

When we look into the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called, we find plainly enough this same general view of the church, which is carried back thus to the very feet, as it were, of the Blessed Apostles themselves. The question, let it be still kept well in mind, is not immediately concerning episcopacy or any other such single interest separately considered. Much has been done to darken the subject, by taking it in this way. The grand point is the conception of the church, and the view taken of its relations to the Christian salvation. Here, we say, all is plain. There is not the least evidence of any real contradiction, so far as this great subject is concerned, between the commencement and the close of the second century. No violent chasm appears, sundering the period of Polycarp, Ignatius and the Roman Clement, from that of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Few as our notices are of the ecclesiastical life of this older time, they are abundantly sufficient to show that the idea of the church, as we find it afterwards everywhere received, was then in full force, ruling both the theory and the practice of religion on all sides. It was held to be a Divine constitution; it was regarded as the real home of the Spirit, and the organ and channel thus of all grace. It was in this view one, universal, and alone, the *Catholic Church* in the full sense of this most significant name, the grand and glorious mystery of the Creed. Men must bow to its authority in this form, in order to be saved. To do so, is faith; not to do so, involves at once the full condemnation of disobedience and unbelief. This clearly is the theory, whether true or false, which underlies all the religious thinking of the Apostolical Fathers.

The church of Smyrna, in its Epistle on the martyrdom of Polycarp, speaks of all the *καθολικαί* of the "holy catholic church" in every place; and tells how Polycarp remembered, in his last prayer, "the whole catholic church throughout the world." Hermas represents the same conception by his symbolical tower, "which appeared throughout of one color, shining like the brightness of the sun," though made up of believers from all nations under heaven, made to be of one mind by their common faith. The whole is as though made of one stone.

Not to be in the structure of the tower, is to be reprobate. The rejected stones lying around it signify "such as have known the truth, but have not continued in it, and are not joined with the saints." The ideas of heresy and schism run into each other, as a common falling away from the historical fact of the church, carrying along with it in some way its own determinate outward form. "It is better," says Clement of Rome, "that you should be found small and have place in the flock of Christ, than that you should be thrust out from his hope in aspiring to be high." This is addressed to those who opposed the presbyters in Corinth, and is a call upon them to submit to the church in its proper ministry; in which view, it is plain, exclusion from the hope of Christ, is made to be just one and the same thing with excommunication from his flock in this outward form.

Ignatius is much more explicit and full. His system is clearly the same with that of Cyprian, though bearing evidently enough also the characteristic marks of an earlier age. All depends, with him, on being in union with the bishop, and so with the church over which he presides, in the name and with the authority of Christ. "Let no one deceive himself," he writes to the Ephesians, c. 5, "if any one be not within the altar, he is destitute of the bread of God." Again *ad Trall.* c. 7: "He that is within the altar is clean, he that is without is not clean; that is, whoever does anything apart from the bishop and the presbytery and the deacon, he is not clean in his conscience." Heretics are stigmatised, *ad Philad.* c. 3, as "evil plants on which Christ bestows no care, because they are not of the Father's planting," and then it follows: "If any one follow a schismatic, he has no inheritance in the kingdom of God." Again, *ad Smyrn.* c. 4, heretics are denounced as "wild beasts in human shape, whom we are not only not to receive, but if possible not even to meet; praying for them only, if perchance they may come to repentance; which indeed is difficult; but still not beyond the power of Jesus Christ, our true life." Afterwards they are described as bringing in other opinions (heterodoxies) against the grace of Jesus Christ, contradicting the mind of God, and making no account of charity; and then it is added, c. 7: "They abstain from the eucharist and prayer, as not acknowledging the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, given for our sins and raised again through the goodness of the Father. Opposing the gift of God disputatiously they die, whereas to continue in charity would be better for them that they might rise again. It is proper therefore to have nothing to do with such." Here plainly heresy is the setting up of private

opinion against what is at hand for faith in the form of known outward authority, which necessarily involves therefore a breach of charity, the rupture of unity, and so a falling away from the real life and immortality which Christ has lodged in the church exclusively under its whole form, as his own mystical body. *Heterodoxy* thus comes to its full sense. It is not one opinion merely pitted against another *opinion*; but opinion as such, in any and every shape, over against faith, and the fixed outward tradition which this is required to receive and obey.

Three topics mainly make up the argument or theme of the Ignatian Epistles; first, the danger to be apprehended from heretics, particularly such as turned the fact of the incarnation into a Gnostic dream; secondly, the vast importance of maintaining the unity of the church; and finally, the great duty of cleaving firmly to the bishop, at the head of his presbyters and deacons, with absolute subjection to his authority. These heads are not brought forward in separate and distinct form; they are made continually to flow into one another, and are so woven together as to show that they are, in the mind of the writer, inwardly related always in the way of cause and effect. The danger of heresy leads him to press the object of church unity, as the only effectual security against its seductive power; and zeal for this interest of unity again becomes a motive to enforce unconditional obedience to the bishops, as the means specially ordained and required for its preservation. No mistake can be greater than to suppose that the glorification of the episcopate with Ignatius is lodged in without other reason for the mere sake of the office itself, or to promote a simply hierarchical interest. It flows as naturally as possible from the burden of his zeal for the spiritual welfare of the churches to which he wrote; and to understand it fully, we need only to make ourselves familiar with the general conception of Christianity in which his spirit moved and had its home. All faith with him, it is plain, stands primarily in an act of submission to the Christian salvation as an outward fact, starting in the mystery of the incarnation and reaching forward from this under a form of existence altogether peculiar to itself in the church. So apprehended it must be necessarily one and whole, in unity and harmony always with itself. The objective, in the nature of the case, must rule and condition the subjective, the new creation can owe nothing to private judgment or private will. The setting up of any such pretension is at once heresy, *αἵρεσις*, something insurrectionary and rebellious over against the concrete fact of Christianity in its own form. It is to be deprecated and resisted, accordingly,

just on this account. The force of the evil is not merely nor primarily in its error of doctrine theoretically considered; it lies rather in the attempt to substitute opinion in some form for the authority of tradition. This, whether the opinion be in one form or in another, strikes at the very foundation of the Christian mystery, and includes in itself necessarily the idea of division and schism. To hold fast the unity of the church, becomes then the indispensable and only sufficient means of preserving and maintaining the truth. The ground and bond of this unity, Ignatius sees in the episcopate. The bishops represent the authority of Christ, and each of them may be said to gather up in himself as a centre the religious life of the particular church over which he presides. Their general charge is at the same time collegiate, like that of the original Apostles from whom they hold their powers in the way of legitimate succession. To be in unity then with itself, and so with the universal or catholic church, and to be secure thus against the invasions of heresy, each particular congregation must remain in close communion with its own bishop and in absolute submission to his authority. This becomes with Ignatius, in such view, a cardinal and fundamental interest. Both the other interests depend upon it; and for this reason, he lays upon it everywhere the main stress of his exhortation, in a way that is apt to strike much of our modern thinking as extravagant and ridiculously absurd.

It would carry us too far to exemplify what we have now said by quotations. Nor is it necessary. No one who knows anything of Ignatius' can need to be informed, what constant stress he lays on submission to the bishop, with his presbyters and deacons, as the very ideal of perfection and prosperity in the condition of every church. His general strain is: "Do nothing without the bishop; keep your flesh as the temple of God; love unity and flee divisions; be ye imitators of Christ, as he is also of the Father. I have done my part, as a man set for unity. Where there is division and wrath, God abides not. To all who repent the Lord will grant forgiveness, if they repent to the unity of God and communication with the bishop" (*ad Philad.* c. 7, 8.). "Hold to the bishops, that God may be with you. I go bail for those who are in subjection to the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons; and with them let me have my part in God" *ad Polyc.* c. 6). Our concern here is not just with Episcopacy. It is with the idea of the church, which must be taken necessarily to lie at the bottom of this view. It is not the episcopate, under any and every view, that carries in it such title to respect. The case supposes a real Divine constitution,

in the bosom of which only the office can be of any heavenly force, and where at the same time it must be in some way the power of a single fact, an office through all its parts in unity with itself, representing thus, not in figure only but in fact, the authority of Jesus Christ in its own proper undivided form. If the Church were a human organization simply, or subject to the limitations and conditions of our human life naturally considered, it would be indeed absurd to talk of its Ministry in this style, and such exaltation of the duty of obedience to it, as the great law of unity and so of security against heresy, might well be considered anything but reasonable and safe. But Ignatius looked upon the case in no such light. All his language implies, that he took the Church to be in truth a supernatural constitution, which as such was to be regarded as of absolute and supreme sufficiency within itself for its own ends. The first duty of all men accordingly is to submit to it in such outwardly objective form. All the ends of righteousness and salvation depend upon acknowledging it, and bowing to it, precisely in this view. Nothing can well be more remote from the independent sectarian notion of religion, that prevails so extensively at the present day. But it falls in with the universal thinking of the church in the first ages.

The Cyprianic doctrine of the church falls back thus, in its fundamental conception, to the earliest Christian time. It was no innovation of the third century upon the faith of the second. However it may have been with the age of the New Testament, it is certain that as soon as we pass beyond that we find ourselves surrounded on all sides with modes of thought, and forms of religious life, which involve at bottom this very scheme as carrying in it the true sense and force of the Christian salvation. So after the third century, its authority continued to be universal. The piety of the fourth and fifth centuries, the religion of such men as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil, the Gregories, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, is conditioned from beginning to end by the conception of the church, as the necessary organ and medium of grace. Augustine in particular, over against the heresies of his time, became the great expositor and spokesman of the doctrine for his own and all following ages. With him, it remained no longer an article simply of faith and strong theological feeling. No one indeed had ever a deeper sense of its glorious significance, in this form. It lay at the foundation of his spiritual life. It formed the very hinge of his conversion. His whole Christian experience was pervaded by the power of it at every point. But what came to him in this way as a fact

of faith, he endeavored also to master in the way of knowledge ; and the result was, that the doctrine was brought to assume, through his wonderfully vigorous mind, a form of scientific consistency and completeness which it had not possessed before. This however was all. He added nothing, properly speaking, to the contents of the doctrine itself.

"Most inwardly was he filled," according to Professor Rothe, "with the thought of the *exclusiveness* of the Catholic Church. In the painful struggles of his own religious history, the ideas of Christianity and the Catholic Church had become for his consciousness completely commensurate and identical. The hold, by which he saved himself from the shipwreck of his interior life, and on which he fastened spasmodically with the whole energy of his powerful spirit, was the absolute conviction that the Catholic Church, and this alone, was a historical revelation, in which the Christian spirit could express and actualize itself in a real way, by which it had a living powerful organism for its operation ; the consciousness in short of the specific and exclusive suitability of the Catholic Church to the Christian life as its proper form.¹ He knew, that it was only by the Catholic Church, and in her, he had himself been able to lay hold of Christianity, that only in communion with her he had found Christian life, healing for his deeply unsettled nature and the satisfaction of all its wants. Before his mind the Catholic Church stood, as the compassionate and loving guide of man, otherwise helplessly abandoned to himself and his errors, with miserable desolation ; as the never failing fountain, out of which alone flowed for him the streams of Divine grace and life ; as the real communion of God on earth, in which alone was to be reached a true life of holy love ; and as the sheltering paternal home, where every one might find, according to his individual need, true care for his infirmities and failings, and a right field at the same time for his religious activity. All these impressions flowed together for him in the general thought—so familiar also already to Cyprian—of the *motherhood* of the Catholic Church, into which he poured the whole inwardness and tenderness of

¹ This consciousness is very beautifully and forcibly expressed, particularly in his tract *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manichaeorum*, L. I. §. 62-64, and in the passage *Contra Epistolam Manichaei*, §. 5, where he gives the grounds of his confidence in the truth and divinity of the Catholic Church. He says here expressly, that the feeling described in the text outweighs with him all single difficulties that might still remain for the understanding.—Note by Rothe.

his deep sensibility. This of itself expresses exclusiveness. Christ is to him altogether identical with the Catholic Church, his life with hers; and without communion with her he holds communion with him to be impossible."¹

The universal authority of the doctrine, finally, meets us under the most impressive form in the ancient symbols or creeds. These differ in some particulars; but never so as to contradict one another; never so as to fall away in the least from the same fundamental scheme or type. This we have in what is known generally as the Apostles' Creed. Here the article of the church forms a special object of faith, which as such must be received of course in the character of a supernatural mystery. All the old church creeds acknowledge it in the same view. There can be no question moreover, but that the sense of the article was in full harmony always with what we have now found to be the doctrine held by the Fathers from the end of the first century on to the beginning of the fifth. We speak not of episcopacy, whether in the Anglican or in the Roman form; what we mean, is the idea of the church as a necessary constituent in the great fact of Christianity, as the Divinely established and exclusively valid form of its actualization in the world, as the real organ and medium of all its power for the salvation of men—an outward historical constitution in this view, which in the nature of the case must be in unity with itself, and to which men must submit by faith, in the spirit of little children, in order to be saved. Nothing less than this, we say, is the sense of the article, as it comes before us in the old creeds. Our modern thinking may give it another sense; may understand it to refer to an abstraction only, the notion of the so called invisible church; but in doing so it ceases to be historical altogether, and will be found in fact to occupy a different standpoint entirely from that of the ancient Christian world, over against the universal sense and spirit of these early creeds. The doctrine, or fact rather, of the holy catholic church, grows here out of the mystery of the incarnation, completing itself in the glorification of the Saviour and the mission of the Holy Ghost; it is a living concrete revelation, founded on the Apostolical commission, and carrying along with it corresponding heavenly powers; it defines itself, with inward necessity, as one, holy, universal, and exclusive, the all sufficient and the only ark of righteousness and salvation. It is a mystery thus for faith.

¹ Die Anf. d. christl. Kirche, p. 680, 681.

Nothing can be more perfectly foreign from the genius of the old creeds, as well as from the religious life universally of the ancient church, than the notion of an experimental religion in the modern sectarian sense, which completes itself on the outside of the church, and without its help, and values this as a sort of outward machinery merely that may become auxiliary afterwards to the working of piety in the other view. From no such standpoint, we may depend upon it, is it possible to fathom the deep meaning of the Apostles' Creed. Every such standpoint is, in truth, the direct negation of the faith to which it gives utterance, contradicts in every position the mystery it was framed to assert and affirm. It holds this mystery for a lie, and sets up another notion altogether, the figment of natural reason simply, in its room and place; and so repeating the old symbol, pretends perhaps to be of one mind still, with this form of sound words originally delivered to the saints. Alas, for the delusion. There is however no excuse for any such mistake. The case is plain, for all who care to understand the truth. The doctrine of the Apostles' Creed in regard to the church, is the same that is presented to us by Irenaeus, by Cyprian, by Athanasius, by Augustine. We owe it both to antiquity and to ourselves, to see and acknowledge here the full truth. The voice of ecclesiastical history is clear. The structure of the creed itself, for one who has gained any true insight whatever into its constitution, is abundantly conclusive. What it affirms, as a foundation principle of faith, is the existence of the church under its outward historical form, as a Divine fact, as the supernatural carrying forward of the work of redemption, as the actual revelation and home of the Spirit, as the real medium of grace, in the bosom of which only, but there surely, may be wrought out the full process of man's salvation, from the remission of sins onward to the resurrection of the body and life everlasting. The church is made to be, without a figure, the organ of the new creation. There it is held to take place. There the heavenly forces on which it depends are considered to be all actually at hand. There the ministry, the bible, the sacraments carry with them a saving power, which can belong to them no where else. This is the very mystery, which gives the article its place in the creed. In what other view could it be an object of faith? How else could men be required to bow to its authority, as a necessary part of the mystery of godliness brought to pass by the Gospel?

In what wide contrast with all this old habit of thought much at least of our modern Protestantism stands, is too plain to re-

quire any sort of proof. The evidence of it is thrown in our way continually from all sides. Take in exemplification the following significant and characteristic passage, which happens to meet our eye while we write, as a passing editorial in a late number of the New York Observer, (July 28,) under the somewhat equivocal caption, *Tampering with the Truth*.

"In the history of the rise and progress of the great apostacy, we have an illustration of the danger of the slightest deviations from fundamental truth. This giant system of iniquity may be traced to the early introduction of what, at first view, appears to be a slight error in doctrine. The apostle Paul informs us that, even in his day, the 'mystery of iniquity' was already at work. And almost up to the apostolic age, we may trace the specious error of sacramental grace, which lies at the foundation of that vast superstructure of spiritual tyranny, which, for ages, spread desolation over both the Eastern and Western churches. The difference between this, as at first taught, and the true doctrine, was apparently so slight that the minds of the multitude, not accustomed to discriminate, might not perceive it. A sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, sealing the covenant relation of believers to God. But, according to this doctrine, grace is communicated to the soul in some mysterious manner, under the form of an outward rite. This is very agreeable to the carnal heart. It saves the necessity of the personal exercise of repentance and faith, relieves of the necessity of self-scrutiny, in order to discern the 'inward spiritual grace,' of which the sacrament is a sign, and turns the whole matter over to the priest.

"This error, in its inception, was so specious, so much in harmony with the prevalent mystical philosophy, and so conformed to the taste of a superstitious age, that it was received by a declining church without suspicion. But there soon grew out of it the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration*. Then followed an increase of sacraments, in order to cover all the supposed wants of the human soul. *Confirmation* was made a sacrament to impart grace for *sanctification*; *Penance*, to secure the pardon of sins committed after baptism; the *Eucharist* was transformed into the real body and blood of Christ, to provide a ground of confidence for the superstitious multitude, without personal piety; and to this is added *extreme unction*, that dying grace may be imparted by anointing the five senses with holy oil. To crown the whole, there is the sacrament of *Orders*, which lays the foundation of the hierarchy, by imparting to the priest the power of conferring grace, in the administration of the sacraments.

"Thus we have a complete perversion of the gospel, by the introduction of a *sacramental religion*, which removes the necessity

of an intelligent reception of the truth, and dispenses with faith, repentance, and holy obedience, and puts the whole affair into the hands of the priest, making his office indispensable to the right exercise of religion. Thus, the whole of Oriental and Papal Christendom lie at the feet of the Priesthood.

"The germ from which has grown up this deadly Bohon Upas tree, whose wide spreading branches overshadow the world, diffusing everywhere the malaria of spiritual death, was this same doctrine of *sacramental grace*, which some learned men in the Protestant churches are seeking to exhume from the catacombs of a past age, and impose upon the wonder-loving credulity of the nineteenth century. Though it must be obvious to the impartial student of history, that from the time of the introduction of this doctrine into the primitive churches, may be traced the gradual departure of the Holy Spirit; till at length the temple of Christ, deserted of his presence became the temple of idols, 'Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.'"

The quotation speaks for itself. It must be confessed too, that it represents well and fairly a large portion of the religious thinking of the present time. Our universal sect system is ready to take up the same key. This precisely is what multitudes mean by the conception of *evangelical religion*, as distinguished from what they hold to be a religion of rites and forms. Our object here is not to have any controversy with the scheme. Let it pass for what it is worth. What we wish is simply to bring into clear view, the relation in which it stands to what was supposed to be Christianity in the first ages. This all should be willing to see and understand, as a matter at least of simple history. It is the character of truth to love the light. What then, in the case before us, is the clear form of fact? Here is a theory of religion, claiming to be the true sense of Protestantism, which boldly repudiates as an apostacy and mystery of iniquity the whole sense of what Christianity was taken to be in the beginning, back at least to the very age next following that of the Apostles. To be on good terms with it, as the self-constituted exponent now of the true meaning of the bible over against the blundering ignorance of all past centuries, we are required to give up to Satan not only the church of the middle ages, but the church also of earlier times from the fifth century up to the very beginning of the second. For it is not with this or that questionable point only, that the issue of the N. Y. Observer is concerned. It goes at once to the very foundations of the ancient faith. The idea of a sacramental religion, we are told, overturns the Gospel. A ministry exercising in any true sense

Divine powers, is taken to be such a conception as opens the way at once for the full reign of Antichrist. Why? Only of course because the Church, the proper home of such a ministry and sacraments of such supernatural force, is not believed to be the grand and awfully solemn mystery which it was held to be in the beginning. All comes to this at last. The idea of a Divine church takes away all difficulty from the idea of sacramental grace, as well as from the idea of a ministry possessed of more than human powers; whereas the want of faith in the church under any such supernatural view, as being the form and medium of the Christian salvation in the world, necessarily involves the want of power to honor the ministry and the holy sacraments under any corresponding view. If the sense of a higher order of life in this form as something actual and real be not at hand, if the church itself be after all a natural constitution only, part of the system of this world in its natural form and nothing more, then indeed it is easy to see how all that belongs to it must sink down to the same region of mere naturalism, and how it must appear no better than miserable pedantry and affectation to think of talking it into any higher sense. Alexander Campbell's "baptismal regeneration," sundered from the idea of a real historical polity bearing along with it from age to age, by strict Apostolical succession, the more than human powers with which the church started in the beginning, is in truth a most pitiful and melancholy sham. And so to the judgment now before us all sacramental religion seems, just because it has no faith in the existence of any such church either now or in time past. But, as we have seen, this faith, right or wrong, enters into the universal Christianity of the first ages. It is not there by accident either or unseemly excrescence. We find it prominently inserted in the Creed. The piety of the second century, as well as that of the third and fourth, is based upon it, and constructed upon it, from beginning to end. The religion of the whole period was beyond all controversy just what is here denounced by the N. Y. Observer, as the complete perversion of the Gospel. The Fathers all believed in the Holy Catholic Church, and showed themselves to be in earnest with this faith, by ascribing to the church Divine functions and powers. If *this* be the grand apostacy, the "mystery of iniquity," they were all hopelessly involved in it from the very start, and the Creed itself becomes the "masterpiece of the Devil."

To this end it must indeed necessarily come, with Protestantism in the unchurchly and unsacramental form. The Puritan Recorder was only a fair exponent of the true inward sense of

the system, when it ventured to say openly some time ago, "that the Creed and Puritanism have not a kindred spirit," and that the life and spirit of the venerable formulary, notwithstanding the place allowed to it "by a sort of courtesy" in the New England Primer, "never entered into the life of the Puritan churches," so that it exists among them now only "as some fossil relic of by-gone ages." Every attempt to restore its buried authority, the Recorder views with pity and contempt. "We are free to confess," it tells us again, "that this Creed has forsaken the Puritans, and gone over to become the idol and strength of all branches of Anti-puritanism. And there are good reasons; for Puritanism builds on the Scriptures, and this Creed teaches, in several respects, anti-scriptural doctrines. It is true, that most of it is *capable of a sense* which harmonizes with the Scriptures, and so the Puritans received it, in *a sense consonant with their theology*—either leaving out, or putting a strained sense upon the passage, which asserts that Christ descended into hell. But it is neither safe nor expedient to receive such a document *in such a perverted sense*. For the document once being admitted, and its authority being made to bind the conscience, then the way is open for those who hold the *errors held by its authors*, to plead that we are bound to receive it *in the sense which its authors gave to it*, and this makes it an instrument of *corrupting the faith of the gospel*." Here we have the cloven foot disclosed without any sort of reserve. Some of the "heretical points" of the creed, as they are called, the Puritan Recorder went on afterwards to expose in form, namely, the descent to hades, the communion of saints, and the holy catholic church. This last it dared to brand as "*a figment*." But as we have just said, Puritanism is fairly expounded here by the unbelieving voice of the Recorder. It has never yet raised any protest against the disclosure thus made at its heavy expense; and we presume it will not do so in time to come. Its whole standpoint is theologically different from that of the primitive church. The faith of this last, as we have it in the creed, is not its faith. It has brought in, beyond all contradiction, *another gospel*; so that the question is now, which is to be regarded as apostolically right and true, the gospel of Puritanism as it rules New England, and much of the world besides in the nineteenth century, or the gospel in which the second century gloried and trusted as a Divine gift handed down from the first. The two systems are not the same. The platform of faith on which the one rests, is by the other openly disowned as unscriptural and contrary to truth.

Here is something surely, which well deserves our most solemn attention and consideration. We do not present it now for any purpose of controversy or debate. We do not pretend to condemn dogmatically in one direction, or to approve in another. What we wish, is merely to bring into view the historical fact, which must remain the same whatever construction we may put upon it, and which needs first of all to be distinctly perceived and acknowledged that it may be construed with intelligence in any way. Evangelical Puritanism, the modern sect system generally, is at war with what was considered to be Christianity in the first ages. The controversy between present and past here regards not simply the order of things in the Nicene period, and afterwards, but reaches up to the age next following that of the Apostles; and it has to do, not with a few accidents only of the old faith, but with its universal form and constitution. The question, in the last instance, is not of the Papacy as such, nor of Episcopacy, nor of Presbytery, nor of Sacramental Grace, nor of the authority of the Holy Scriptures. All falls back just to this: Has there ever been in the world such a Divine constitution as the Holy Catholic Church, in the sense of the ancient creeds? It is another question, which we need carefully to distinguish from this, whether there be any such Divine organization, with supernatural functions and powers, actually at hand in the world *now*. We may dispose of this second question afterwards as shall seem best; before it comes plainly the other: Was there *ever* any order of this sort in Christian history? Were the first ages right, or were they wrong, in making the existence of it an article of faith, and in grounding upon it the entire weight of the world's salvation? Here it is, that the chasm which yawns so fearfully between the past and the present comes fairly and fully into view. Puritanism does not believe, what was believed most firmly in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp, that the Church stood among men as an actual polity, created by Divine commission, and endowed with corresponding heavenly powers for its own ends. What was a foundation mystery of faith in the one case, is scouted as a dangerous unscriptural "figment" in the other. In this way, Puritanism breaks with the universal Christianity of the first ages; turns its *Creed* into a grand *Lie*; for all must go together, if any regard is to be had to the original sense of the symbol; and so literally converts the course of church history into a wholesale radical apostacy and delusion from the very start.

Such is the simple historical fact. Who will deny, that it is

full of unutterable solemnity and interest? Here is the question of questions surely at this time, for all who can rise above the paltry prejudices of party and sect, so as to take any interest in the truth for its own sake. Alas, that the number of such should be so few! Is the old church doctrine of the Apostles' Creed—or *was* it rather—fact or figment, a reality or a dream? Was it a true "heavenly vision" to which fathers, martyrs and saints, did well "not to be disobedient;" or must it be regarded, on the contrary, as the most melancholy hallucination that ever took possession of the human mind, the art of Satan playing himself off as an angel of light, the mystery of iniquity "leading captivity captive," in a new downward sense now, most horrible to think of, for at least fourteen hundred years? What are all other questions, with the everlasting din that is made about them in our Babel of sects, as compared with this?

Was there ever among men a *Church*, in the sense of the Creed, a Divine constitution, carrying in itself real grace as an order of existence *above nature*, and rightly challenging in such view the "obedience of faith?"

That is the first question. Only where it is answered in the affirmative, of course, can there be any room for the second; which *then*, however, cannot fail to come home with like awful solemnity—as a waking and not merely sleep-walking interest—to every mind that is seriously bent on being saved:

Is the mystery of a *Divine Church* in this old sense still at work in the world? Are the glorious things once spoken of Zion yet true and real, as they were held to be in the first ages? Or has that heavenly vision dissolved long since into thin air and mere Gnostic idealism, like the baseless fabric of a dream which leaves no wreck behind?

J. W. N.

ZWINGLI AS A COMMENTATOR.

The Sermon on the Mount.—Matthew—Chapter v.

THE Evangelist here furnishes an accurate report of the sermon of Christ; and this not summarily merely, as in other instances, but in a more complete form. In this sermon our Lord teaches how to mould, not the outer man only, but still more the inner. The exterior man is that which falls under the observation of the eye, and the outer senses, and can be apprehended by others. The interior however, which lies within, and is hidden from the eyes of men, cannot be thus apprehended. "No one hath known the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him" 1 Cor. 2. Do you say: How then does a man know himself, seeing that all lack the means of perfect self-knowledge. We do not say that any one fully knows himself, but affirm that the purposes, even of the worst man, may be unknown to others. When we say therefore, the interior man inspects itself, we speak of the inner man as it ought to be. Just as when we say, all fathers love their children, although there be many who neglect and hate their children; but we speak of those whose dispositions are rightly ordered. The exterior man therefore is that which shows itself in words and deeds; the interior that which is concealed from public view. Thus when we say, he speaks excellently concerning piety, but it does not seem to proceed from the heart. You here see a twofold man, and that in the same person. And just as the inner man is unknown to all others, so it is difficult to bring it to a proper knowledge of itself. Then first does it make a true discovery of itself when it lays itself open before God, who is the light which penetrates all things. If he examines and contemplates himself by this light he speedily discovers a den of iniquity within him, and abhors himself. He finds there pride, covetousness, envy, and selfishness. However much therefore the interior man conceals itself, and endeavors to lurk in secret, it discovers itself by certain marks to the pious and prudent; neither can its hypocrisy remain forever hidden. But if the external man so often deceives our judgment, why should it surprise us, that the interior man cannot be easily detected by us? For even when the disease breaks out, and affords some opportunity of discovering its presence, the symptoms may only be partial, so that its nature cannot be fully ascertained. But when man discovers and contemplates himself in the light of divine truth, he finds within him a hydra-den of evils. Neither

can any one hide himself from the face of God, nor draw near, without terror, to him who is infinitely holy and pure. For who can dwell with devouring flames? As fire rejects and casts off water thrown upon it, so the Divine purity rejects whatever is impure. In this sermon therefore Christ teaches us what belongs to the right cultivation of the inner man, and also what is required by the proper management of the outer man. He shows what affections should be cherished in the breast of man, if we would be pure and holy in the sight of God, what, at least, we should most zealously cultivate, as far as it may be possible for us to do in this mortal flesh. Thus he first declares: Blessed are the poor in spirit; which pertains to the inner man. Then he says: Let your light shine, ye are the salt of the earth, which are directions for the government of the outward man. Those precepts which pertain to the proper cultivation of the interior man, apply with equal force to all the children of God. What is said concerning the outward man should not be referred equally to all, for there are different offices and services in the ecclesiastical body. That we should be poor in spirit, therefore, is said to all, but not so when it is enjoined to be pungent like salt. For this constitutes the office of the apostles and prophets.

Aperiens os suum.—This is said by way of hypotyposis, or rhetorical description. By ascending the mountain, the superior excellence of that which he was about to teach is indicated.

Pauperes spiritu.—That is in heart or mind. It is possible for a person to be magnanimous, and yet have a modest mind, and be truly humble before God. When the angel smote the people with the plagues, David entreated that he might be punished in their stead, and his people saved. Was not this great modesty in so great a king? Paul was of a most humble spirit, and yet displayed great magnanimity. "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh." May the nobles of our times reflect upon these things, who regard not the lives of the common people, but show their haughtiness and ferocity by words like these: Let the peasantry be killed, let them be hung; and who think no more of strangling a peasant, than they would of choking a cock. There is the spirit truly humble, when in all it does, it seeks the glory of God and the good of others. Where this is not done, the heart is insolent, fierce, and proud. If we examine ourselves in the sight of God by this rule, how many more things will we find done by us from vain glory, or ambition, or some other like affection, than with true faith and a pure conscience!

Beati qui lugent.—The men of this world, seduced by carnal pleasures, break forth into laughter, and indulge in immoderate joy. But where faith in Christ flourishes moderation is maintained in all things, and nothing improper is allowed. Faith restrains the heart, does not permit the head to carry itself too high, does not give loose reigns to lust, but with a firm bit checks and curbs the impetuosity of the flesh, lest it should run wildly onward in its course. For whoever examines himself by the light of divine truth, always finds occasion for self-condemnation, and reason for sadness and grief, so that he has no opportunity for immoderate merriment and laughter, and for indecorous exultations. The believer dies daily to these things, and endeavors daily to eradicate one or another of them. But meanwhile, this mourning of which Christ here speaks, is the source of the highest joy. Paul teaches, in his epistle to the Philippians, in what true Christian joy consists. For that entire epistle re-echoes with the voice of rejoicing. In these words therefore Christ rather consoles those who are afflicted and mourn, than recommends grief, as he elsewhere says: Ye weep and mourn now, but your grief shall be turned into gladness, &c.

Beati mites.—Meekness is opposed to insolence and audacity, just as compassion is opposed to cruelty. Meekness and compassion therefore differ. Audacity is impudent in everything, it is pugnacious, quarrelsome, contentious, clamorous, vociferous, and bloodthirsty, and does everything tumultuously and rashly. Meekness shrinks from everything of this sort, lest it should inflict or occasion pain to any one, or use violence towards any. It does not approve of insolence, nor protect the truth with injury. Is any one insolent and fierce in his bearing, he is not meek, but betrays the temper of a tyrant. The truly meek cannot endure to see violence and injury done to any one. They who do not withstand the cruel and insolent, nor condemn wickedness and vice, are not to be called meek but weak. And since these directions pertain (as was said) to the interior man, they do not exactly apply to the external duties of judges, magistrates, and ministers; for these must often be severe and strenuous, in executing the merited punishment of the wicked. But even they should maintain meekness of spirit, amid the severity of demeanor and language proper to the faithful discharge of their duty.

Possidebunt terram.—"Earth" might here to be understood Hebraically, as equivalent to the promised land. But we prefer to consider it as referring to the land of the living, that is eternal life.

Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam.—Some one might say, if we be thus meek, iniquity will increase and flourish. To this secret objection the Saviour replies when He says: I do not desire you to be meek, so as to spare and cherish wickedness; but I call them happy who hunger and thirst after righteousness. They who suffer thirst, forthwith enter the city and inquire where they may obtain the best wine. But how slothful are we about seeking and subserving righteousness, even though we may sometimes desire and enact good laws, still no one cares to have them obeyed. Why is this? Because we have no thirst after righteousness. He who has truly this thirst, wishes that all may be just, asserts and vindicates righteousness, and, if any iniquity springs up, seeks boldly, with great diligence and severity to have it eradicated.

Saturabuntur.—They who vindicate righteousness, will be apt to kindle great animosity against themselves. They who resist the wicked, will probably excite the hatred of such against themselves. Wherefore the Lord comforts them and says: I will satisfy them. Here in this world already they shall be satisfied with what they long after, but still more in the world to come. And should not this satisfaction be desired by all, namely the delight of seeing and externally enjoying the highest and purest good? Do we not often feel a warm desire for the company and fellowship of a good man? How much more reasonable therefore that we should be inflamed with love for the most high and righteous God?

Beati misericordes.—This virtue consists in the exercise of kindness and beneficence towards the poor and wretched. This, we are assured, is most acceptable to God.

Beati mundo corde.—No one is perfectly innocent, no one absolutely pure in heart. But they have pure hearts, whose hearts are renewed by faith, and cleansed from the defilements of sin and vice, to whom iniquity is offensive, and who daily endeavor to amend their lives, cultivating truth, integrity, purity, and justice, and daily meditating upon these things. They keep their mouths from all filthy conversation, from detraction, railery, and every impurity. The actions of such are fair and honest; their business, contracts, and dealings are free from fraud and deceit. Men of this sort are to be entrusted with important public functions.

Pacifici.—They are properly thus denominated, who are skillful in conciliating peace. Charity (saith Paul) thinketh no evil, and beareth all things. This virtue is opposed to envy and malice, and dismisses whatever might beget discord. But this

declaration of Christ is to be so received that it may agree with that other: I have not come to send peace but a sword. For the Spirit who speaks in Christ, nowhere contradicts himself. These two declarations therefore must be reconcileable with each other. Sometimes, when the sons of God desire to promote true peace, the wicked will not permit them, but excite animosity and malice against the truth. Whenever the truth is preached the world is thrown into commotion. The peace therefore which the pious are to effect, should be maintained within the limits which God has set for it; if these are transgressed, it can by no means be called peace. Some desire to be thought peaceful and pacific, although they connive at and flatter all manner of crime, however great, and permit vice to go unproved. But only then is our peace worthy to be called truly such; when it harmonizes with the peace of God. The peacemakers of Christ therefore may either confirm or disturb the peace of the world.

Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam.—A double promise is given to righteousness; for Christ has said above, Blessed are they who hunger and thirst, &c. Nothing is more needful and indispensable to human society than righteousness. Whatever evils and calamities are in the world proceed from this that we are unrighteous, and are willing to endure nothing for righteousness sake. They who seek to maintain righteousness, procure nothing from the world but hatred and death. Wherefore the Lord promises to such the kingdom of heaven, and calls them happy whom the world execrates as villains and wretches. Only we need to guard carefully against being guilty of the wickedness charged upon us. Then truly is a great and glorious reward promised to those who thus maintain righteousness, namely an eternal kingdom in the heavens, although he sometimes compensates them in this life already. He instances the prophets as defenders of righteousness, that we may see that such vindication belongs especially to the prophetic and apostolical offices, though it is required of all his disciples. Indeed persecution is the common temporal reward of all the good and just. Thus Christ consoles his followers, by predicting coming persecutions, if they diligently pursue their calling. Assuredly an arduous and difficult calling, which none but the foolish or wicked will rashly covet!

Vos estis sal terrae.—This we think applies properly to the apostolic office. By the use of a beautiful and familiar metaphor, Christ admonishes the apostles concerning their duties. References to salt are frequently found in proverbs. Salt was

formerly used in religious oblations, to typify that the prophetic office, whose teachings and exhortations were to be mixed with some severity, should expel and banish all wickedness. Salt is used for seasoning articles of food, and preserving them from worms and putrefaction. The salt of the Church is the word of God, which those entrusted with its management, must use in proper and needful measure. They who are negligent and indolent lack this element, and preach either for gain or to procure the means of gratifying their appetites; they are blind leaders, dumb dogs. A little salt will preserve a large quantity of food, and one prophet is often sufficient for a whole church, if only the salt is not wanting.

Vos estis lux mundi.—The wisdom of God often teaches and illustrates the same truth in various ways. Here Christ repeats what he had just said, only that he sets forth the truth still more clearly. These two precepts pertain primarily to the apostolic office, and regulate their external conduct; although at the same time they may be applied, to a certain extent, to all the children of God. We thus explain them: It was the function of the Apostles to go about the world and testify concerning Christ, to draw men from the world to Christ, and aid them in escaping from the darkness of death to the light of truth, from a course of sin, to a life of integrity and purity. To effect this their preaching must needs be severe and stringent, with a setting forth of truth biting as salt. This truth therefore they must hold forth, by word and conduct, as a light to the world. When this is done, the impious and wicked abhor the light of truth, turn from it, hate, persecute, and if possible, extinguish it. It is of little use to be sharp in our preaching, unless the life of the preacher is also lucid and pure. Hence I said, that these directions apply mainly to apostles and ministers of the Church, yet so that they may not improperly be accommodated to all its single members. Descending therefore from the literal, and (if I may say so) the ceremonial sense of these words, their internal and chief signification being meanwhile preserved, we shall find that they commend a virtue which all christians in common should exhibit. Publicly to preach, and perform apostolic functions is not binding upon all the faithful, Eph. iv, 1 Cor. xii. But to profess the truth, to oppose wickedness, and let the light of good works shine forth, pertains equally to all. Abraham pursued the kings with a collected band, and rescued his friend Lot. To aid in the deliverance and rescue of a brother is the privilege of all men, but to attack kings in a general war, is not the duty of all, but devolves upon the public magistrates. To

do good therefore to a brother, to assist as far as possible in rescuing him, is allowed to all Christians, provided care be taken not to transgress the proper limits of law and order. Scipio, a courageous and brave man, expelled Hannibal from Italy, after Carthage had been overthrown. We may not all possess the requisite qualities for such achievements; but to drive an enemy from our homes, is to do with fortitude and intrepidity whatever is obligatory upon us. Run thus in your thoughts through particular cases, carefully distinguishing between what is merely external and personal, and what is internal, rejecting the former and retaining the latter. The public office of preaching therefore belongs only to those appointed thereto, to let the light of truth shine is the duty of all. To be fearless and steadfast, in the defence of truth and justice is required of all; but not to preach and execute the laws. It is therefore not the duty of apostles only to profess the truth, though they especially are expected to do this. But, alas! for shame! we are so hoodwinked and blinded to falsehood and iniquity, we are so much terrified at darkness, that we embrace vice for virtue. There is no one who opposes himself as a wall of brass to the wicked, no one who steps forth in fearless vindication of the truth; none who kindles the bright torch of truth and light, and holds it intrepidly forth to view. What else then may we expect, under such a confederation of iniquity, but the avenging wrath of God! Let Sodom's doom admonish us!

Non potest oppidum abscondi supra montem situm.—Here the Saviour expresses almost the same sentiment by an equally elegant figure. It is not possible for a city built on an eminence, from whence it can be seen on every side, to carry on its affairs secretly or covetly. You, (says Christ), are like such a city, exposed to the gaze of all men. Let your holiness of life be manifest to all, then will they also be able to estimate your doctrine. And indeed you will not be able silently to hold or to conceal the truth which I have committed to you, if you embrace it with true faith.

Necque lucernam accendit, &c.—The whole world is buried in the deepest and densest darkness; there is need therefore that you light this lamp, and place it in the centre, instead of covering up the truth and conniving at iniquity. Should you do this latter, you would resemble a foolish man who should hide his lighted candle under a bushel. And yet how natural it is for those to do this, who wish to favor or flatter themselves in the indulgence of their darling sins. One thinks he may indulge in adultery, another considers it very honorable for him to be-

come a soldier for hire, and shed innocent blood. Preachers and teachers in the Church should seek to dispel this darkness. But with what weapon? With the word of truth, with the light of faith. If they conceal this truth, being frightened from duty by the fear of man, or undue regard for human favor, who can be worse, or who exert a more baneful influence than they!

Sic luceat lux vestra, ut videant opera.—But elsewhere He forbids their doing good so as to be seen of men. Divine wisdom however never contradicts itself. We are to live in such a manner that by the brightness of our good works, and the reputation of our virtues others may be attracted and inflamed with love for piety, our life must spread a pleasant fragrance around us. True, we are not to array ourselves with the glory of the good works which the grace of God may have wrought through us, nor to attribute to ourselves the praise, as the pharisees do. —Thus Paul says to his son Timothy, "Let no one despise thy youth," which nevertheless (in one sense) Timothy could in no wise prevent: he means therefore to admonish him so to live as to afford no one a just occasion for such contempt. A virtuous life will confer glory. But such a life is not to be pursued for the sake of this glory, which, if acquired, is to be referred to the grace of God, the fountain of all goodness. Let your purity and faith be seen of men, that they may give praise to God the Father, who sent you unto them that you might thus gather them unto Him.

Non veni ut destruam legem, sed ut adimpleam.—Christ fulfilled the law. He did this in the first place, by complying with its outward injunctions, and submitting to all its ceremonial requirements, such as circumcision, &c. Secondly in this, that all things prefigured and predicted by the law concerning him were fulfilled in him. In the third place, by excelling in obedience to the precepts of the law, exactly according to the mind of the Lawgiver. For never did he vary in the least point from the will of God, who did no sin neither was guile found in his mouth. Finally, he fulfilled the law for us, that is he rendered satisfaction to the Divine justice, and bore the penalty which we had incurred by our violation of the law.

Quisquis fecerit et docuerit.—Christ exhorts his disciples to exemplify by works what they taught by word; even as he himself did. For although no one may attain to the perfection exhibited by Christ, yet each one should endeavor, according to the grace given him, and the measure of his ability, to copy after this great exemplar, and most diligently imitate Christ in all possible things. If indeed we are Christians, we should put

on Christ. They who think that a minister of the word should not declare the whole truth in public assemblies, nor reprove vice, would convert him into a piper, placed in the pulpit to play according to each one's pleasure and fancy. Thus only can he make himself acceptable and grateful to all. But it is not enough for the preacher to hold forth his doctrine truly; we must be ready also to exemplify and practice the truth with intrepidity. Otherwise we shall resemble a fluteplayer who may perform correctly enough for the dance, but who plays for a company of old decrepit persons, unable, on account of bodily infirmity, to stir a foot or move a limb. But those who possess manly vigor, as soon as the flute is heard, leap forth and imitate its notes with measured steps, and that not carelessly or lazily, but with great alacrity and delight. We daily hear the truth, and are incited to purity of life; but who exercises himself in the practice of truth and virtue? But if all such proper personal effort is wanting, assuredly we have never yet truly and heartily resolved to amend our ways. Alas! for our sluggish stupor!—By the kingdom of heaven, I here understand the Church.

Coelum et terra transibunt.—The comparison is equivalent to this: Sooner shall heaven, the most enduring element, pass away, than my word fail.

Nisi abundaverit justitia vestra.—Although this is primarily addressed to the apostles, they must necessarily be applicable to all believers. For when Christ taught that he should become great in the kingdom of heaven, who should do and teach, &c., there was danger that some would aspire to be considered the greatest, because he had in some small measure complied with this condition. Whilst all arrogate to themselves the names of the highest virtues, few may still be real Christians. Many there are, who are more anxious to seem to be, than really to be good. This hypocrisy Christ reprove, and says: Unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Who the Pharisees were, may be learned from Josephus. He calls the scribes such as were learned and skilled in the law. In German these learned Scribes are sometimes called *Schryber*.—In what their righteousness consisted, may be easily gathered from Matth. v: 15-23, and Luke vii: 11, &c. If we believe the testimony of Christ concerning them, they made every thing serve their vain glory, making the outside clean, that they might shine before men, whilst within they were most impure and full of filth. Christ on the contrary desires that his apostles, and all who wish

to be his disciples and members, should cultivate true piety and virtue, which consists not merely in externals, but has its habitation in the heart, so that they may be sincerely good, and not merely feign goodness. God requires the heart to be pure, and purged of evil affections: the external mien avails not, if the heart be depraved and vile. Christ proves this now by specific examples; and first by the workings of anger, which is an affection so common to all, that no one is wholly free of it. If any one manages this affection so that he merely feigns gentleness and mildness, he is chargeable with hypocrisy. He is the truly pious man, who curbs and checks the inward feeling of wrath, so that it may never harm or injure a fellow man. What is said concerning anger, may be understood as applying also to other affections.

Audistis quod dictum sit antiquis, Non occides.—Here the Lord treats more strictly of the interior man, penetrating the recesses of the human heart. This is not spoken of the judge who condemns to death according to law and justice, but of the private citizen, forbidding him to slay any one through anger. It is as though he had said: You have heard it said by the ancients, Thou shalt not kill! This is correctly and well said, if it be rightly understood. But it is not enough that you kill no one; whoever indulges wrath, violates the law. For the law requires more than the restraint of the hand, it forbids the affection, the anger itself. They who are angry, or betray their wrath by any act, or who under the influence of this emotion break forth into contumacious language, are not less guilty before God, than those who are convicted and condemned for murder before an earthly judge. They who kill are themselves slain by the executioners of the law, and lose their lives. Before the Supreme Judge, they who cherish anger, are thought worthy of eternal death; for God looketh to the heart. Whoever therefore bears wrath in his heart, is as guilty before God, nay more so, than he who commits murder in the presence of the magistrate. Not that Christ makes all sins equal, as some have falsely concluded from what he here says, as if the conception of hatred were in every sense as great a crime as murder. His purpose is to purge the heart, and stop the springs and veins of wickedness. For whoever resists sinful emotions, may easily shun the sins. But he who disregards these apparently small beginnings, may very readily fall into grievous crimes: by admitting the first movements of passion, he is in danger of being speedily swept away by its stronger current. For whence come thefts and murders? Are they not the fruit of excessive hatred

and wrath? Whoever therefore guards against these, will not be apt to spill human blood. There are doubtless grades in crime, and one is more grievous than another.—Christ therefore everywhere holds forth the most perfect examples of piety, which are to be most carefully copied and imitated by us. Such an example His own character affords. Be holy (he says) for I am holy. Also, be perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect. Meanwhile Christ knows our infirmity, and accommodating his exhortation to it, admonishes that if we cannot reach the highest perfection, nor keep clear of all sinful affections, we shall yet earnestly exert ourselves to do what we can, and to restrain our evil affections from overt sin. He will acknowledge them if they only succeed in these endeavors, even though they should not be entirely faultless, or perfectly obey the law. As if he should say: I know your infirmity, I know that you cannot prevent every wrong emotion, I know how impetuous is the force of anger; only take heed that the doors of your hearts are not thrown open wide for its admission. Or if it should gain entrance, labor lest it break out into actual deed and death. Altogether therefore Christ teaches three things: First he describes the highest perfection, viz: to exclude all angry emotions. But knowing this to be impossible, he tempers his admonitions to our infirmity, and lays down other precepts which impose a curb upon the violence of our affections, and restrain their actual outbursts. “If you cannot wholly keep yourselves from angry emotions, which I especially exhort you to do, guard against outward exhibitions thereof, and the utterance of passionate words. Or if your anger should impel you to this, still hold back your hand from violence and blood. Rather would I have you keep yourselves wholly guiltless, and free from every angry emotion, and my law demands this; for such disciples I desire to have and love. Nevertheless I will not cast you off if you should err through sudden surprise, provided you then recover yourselves and restrain your passion. Maintain moderation in all things. I know the power of sinful affections, I know how greatly they prevail, and how impotent men are against their assaults. To be insensible to all affections is the nature of a stone, not of flesh; but to moderate the affections, and firmly restrain them, to refuse serving so wicked a master, this is something worthy of my disciples. Those who have vowed to be mine, regulate all things by faith, neither will they transgress the limits it assigns, but attacking their evil affections with the weapons of faith, they at least save themselves from falling into more grievous iniquity, if they cannot maintain per-

fect purity. They who with boldness and impudence give loose reins to their affections, are destitute of faith, and unworthy to be numbered among my disciples."—But the third truth that Christ teaches is this: If, through my grace given you, you are enabled to keep your hand from the fatal blow, or even your tongue from maledictions and contumely, ascribe none of the credit to yourselves. Always consider that your heart is not free of guile, and that in the sight of God, you, who were conceived and born in sin, are wholly impure and deserving of eternal condemnation. He who restrains himself from shedding blood should not exalt himself over the wretched murderer, as though he himself were free of every fault; for in his own heart may lie concealed the same poison which, in the murderer's case, broke out into crime, that is anger. Let no one flatter himself therefore, because it has not burst forth in him. For if I had not restrained him by my grace, he might have sinned still more grievously. Not only he who strikes, but he who hates his neighbor is a murderer.—This doctrine of Christ therefore teaches us vigorously to oppose all evil affections, so that the godly, being influenced by faith and the Spirit of God, may prevent their more violent outbreaks, and keep them from transgressing all proper bounds. Next He teaches, that we should never applaud ourselves, or arrogate any thing to ourselves, or become proud, even though we shall remain free from more grievous sins; for there is no one who could endure the severer scrutiny of God, none whose life is faultless, none who fully exhibits the perfection He requires in his law. Christ therefore does not desire his apostles or other disciples to shine before others by any peculiarity of manner, or hypocritical pretensions, or to exhibit a haughty self-righteousness of life, but rather that they should endeavor to master their affections, and cultivate hearty sincerity; for the less such may succeed in their sincere endeavors, the more will they trust in the grace and mercy of God through Christ. This is true righteousness, for it is the righteousness of faith; and since hypocrites are destitute of this, Christ admonishes his disciples that they excel them in this respect.

Si obtuleris munus tuum etc.—This is stated in the way of an example: for the law concerning oblations and sacrifices was then in force. The choice proposed is between offering a sacrifice, or pardoning a brother who may have wronged us; and Christ teaches that in such a case it is more pleasing to God to forgive an injury and dismiss all anger against him, than to offer a sacrifice according to the law of Moses. I prefer, (says He),

charity towards your neighbors, to all the oblations you can offer.—And what he here teaches concerning oblations, may be understood of all external forms of worship.

Habeto benevolentiam cum adversario.—An adversary is one with whom we may have a litigation or action at law. This precept also has reference to the government of the external and internal man. Human affairs are uncertain and variable, and human judgments are often fallacious, so that he who supposes he has the better cause, may have sentence pronounced against him. Christ therefore would dissuade and deter his followers from all such strifes, deriving an argument against them from their perilous uncertainty: He, often, who has the most right on his side loses his cause, whereas he often prevails who merits punishment. By this however our Lord would dissuade them only from private contention and strife, not from the vindication of justice or the punishment of the wicked.—God has endowed man with affections and desires, which, when excited by some suitable object, will agitate and burn like sulphur ignited by a flame, unless faith and the fear of God, restrain and moderate them. Faith therefore, like an ever watchful guard of the soul, and a careful guide of our life always admonishes thus: This is not lawful, or it is proper only to such an extent. Or it counsels the soul as the physician does his patient: This you may not eat, or of this only so much.—The first assaults of these evil affections are often so violent, that they can scarcely be repelled. They are however thus perverse, because we are all conceived and born in sin; the disease is hereditary, and therefore clings so tenaciously to our flesh. But God has given us his spirit and his word, so that if our natural affections at any time grow vehement and wild, we may control and moderate them according to the rule which He thus furnishes.—By this precept then Christ teaches us that we should be conciliatory and forgiving. And if the matter should be of so great importance that occasion of offence or danger to the church would spring out of such forgiveness, he exhorts them to consent to the plucking out of an eye, &c.—of which however more by and by.

Non committes adulterium.—In the preceding paragraph Christ illustrated his doctrine by a case setting forth the vehemence of anger. Here he exemplifies it by allusion to the equally violent affections of lust of the flesh and concupiscence. It is not enough not to defile your neighbor's wife, you are an adulterer, if you look upon her with an immodest eye, if in your heart you lust after her; for adultery flows from the heart.

Hypocria is used for every kind of filthiness and impurity of the flesh. In a word, the doctrine of Christ every where tends to this, that evil affections are mortal sins in the sight of God, and that His law requires a heart that is pure and free from their stains. But the doctrine of the Pharisees taught men merely to order their outward conduct aright, and did not penetrate to the cleansing of the affections of the heart, affirming that the law was fully kept if a man did not actually defile his neighbor's wife, even though he should meanwhile indulge the passion in his heart. That this doctrine is wholly false Christ proves by various examples, saying: Do you suppose that no one criminalizes himself, who merely lusts, or looks impurely upon his neighbor's wife? Why he has already committed the sin, and rendered himself worthy of eternal death in the sight of God, by having thus taken the first steps towards its actual perpetration. Let no one therefore think himself innocent and pure, if he has not yet executed iniquity conceived and cherished in his heart. The fire of lust burns within him although it may be covered up, and kept from flaming out before the eyes of men. Before God it is as open as though it had been perpetrated, and it is not possible to conceal it.—Some one may now say, If the case stands thus, that a man is equally guilty whether he suppresses his evil passions, or permits them to break forth into overt sin, I will give them the reins, and enjoy the gratification of my desires.—Let that be far from you. For it is far easier to control and extinguish a fire that is burning within only, than when it has burst out and spread conflagration on every side. And yet that it is really fire in an incipient state, even though it be prevented from breaking out, no one of sane mind can deny. No one therefore will find occasion from the doctrine of Christ, for sinning boldly, or permitting himself to break out into more grievous iniquities. For He does not wish to teach, that he who indulges his sinful affections, merely is as guilty as he who permits those affections to lead him to overt sins; but rather this, that not only he is a sinner who perpetrates the wicked deed, but he also who indulges in sinful affections, if sins are to be judged according to the strict measure of the justice and holiness of the Divine law. Hypocrites and Pharisees deceive themselves therefore in supposing and teaching that the law of God does not prohibit wrong affections but only sinful acts. God inspects the heart, if that is impure, outward conduct however fair in appearance is of no value.—Thus Christ shows us that we are all sinners, so that we may be humble, and not disdain our neighbor because he may have fallen into more

grievous sins than we, seeing that we all are guilty, and in need of grace.—From the few examples which Christ employs, it is easy to infer the depravity of other sinful affections.—You may pervert judgment for some trifling bribe, for cheese or venison; another does it for a thousand crowns; which is the greater sinner? Assuredly he who receives the larger bribe. But meanwhile you betray your liability to be overcome by wicked desires, upon whom so small a gift could exert so powerful an influence. Each one therefore sins in permitting himself to be corrupted by a bribe, and thereby evading the strict requirements of justice.

Quod si oculus tuus dexter etc.—By the use of an epanodon Christ returns to what he had previously said, and as it were qualifies the assertion then made: I said, that you should forgive an injury, and be easily persuaded to pardon offences. I wish you to understand me thus: if the wrong is so great that it affects the whole body, it is noway to be spared, but even an eye must be plucked out, or a hand or foot be cut off, so that the body may be saved from ruin. The eye is the preacher or bishop, the hand is the ruler, king or magistrate, the foot is the ordinary member of the church. Or it may be differently expounded, as we have shown in the 40th Art. of the Book of Articles of our faith.—The Anabaptists, by not observing these distinctions confound every thing, at one time affirming that a Christian should not fill a civil office, at another that the wicked should not be put out of the way. As if it were not better lawfully to dispatch the wicked, than to permit a Christian community to become a place of refuge for criminals, and all who violate the laws. Is then the church of Christ to be a den of thieves? To exercise such clemency towards all, however grossly they may offend, what were this else than to nourish and cherish every form of crime? To show mercy to none, on the other hand, would be equally unjust and pernicious. Either extreme must be deprecated. True faith chooses the proper medium, being indulgent where clemency is allowable, and exacting the penalty where it should be executed. They who discharge their office with true faith and charity, will not allow themselves rashly to err in these matters.—Does some one inquire, Who therefore should put out the eye? I answer, the Church, or the Magistrate who does not bear the sword in vain. For there is a twofold rod. With the one the Church strikes, namely by excommunication or separation. For the Church must cast out the refractory until they repent, Math. 18, 1 Cor. 5. If any one amends his ways under the infliction of this rod, it is well, for the Church is content with repentance and amend-

ment. But those who despise this rod, and plunge into excessive crimes, must be restrained by the other severer rod, namely the civil sword. For these become so audacious that unless the fear of the sword restrain them, they are ready to perpetrate any enormity. These therefore are to be removed by the magistrate, to whom is committed this office for the punishment of the wicked, and the preservation and defence of the good. If this can be effected without the sword, let it be done, in the case of those namely who give promise of improvement; for others he must not bear the sword in vain. It is better to cut off a diseased and infected member, which cannot be cured, than to suffer the whole body to perish. The Church therefore should exclude the disorderly until they exhibit a change of mind and shew better fruit. If such clemency fails to profit them, it is the duty of the Christian magistrate to lay hold of them and punish them, so that innocence may be shielded against crime, and public peace and piety may be maintained.

Quicunque repudiaverit uxorem suam.—The Jews were accustomed upon the slightest occasion to put away their wives, that they might the more freely indulge their passions. Christ therefore imposes a check upon their intemperance. He restrains their passions, and sets limits which it is unlawful to transgress. Fornication or adultery however are specially named, not as though there were no other causes of divorce, or as though he would prescribe this alone, but for the purpose of stating one among many. For it is usual in the holy Scriptures to employ one example as a representative of all comprehended under that kind. Adultery therefore is not to be considered the only cause of divorce, although it is indeed the chief cause. For why should our Lord make an exception in favor of crimes which are as bad as or worse than adultery, such as treason, poisoning, murder, &c.? But that this method of employing one example for many is common in the Scriptures, will be manifest, to pass in silence over any other proof, from Deut. xix, where only one case of involuntary homicide is mentioned, namely when the axe, slipping from the hand accidentally inflicts a fatal wound upon a neighbor, in which case the homicide may have opportunity to escape to the appointed refuge. What if a stone or tile falling from the roof of a house, should, contrary to the will of him who may be refitting the house, fall upon and kill some one passing by? Or suppose such a misfortune should happen with a piece of wood or anything else? Was the place of refuge appointed by the Lord for him alone who unintentionally killed a man with an axe? Assuredly not; but only one case is stated

in the way of example, from which it is easy to infer the rest. By whatever weapon therefore one man might kill another involuntarily and without animosity, and under whatever circumstances such a misfortune might occur, the Lord intended there should be an asylum for him, although meanwhile but a single instrument is named. There are many ways in which such an accident might occur, and it is equally fatal if a man perishes with wood, as if he were killed with iron.

Ne juretis omnino.—From this the Anabaptists contend that all oaths are forbidden, and must be refused by Christians. But we can show certainly that this error arises from their ignorance of the language. For the German word *Schweeren*, to which they suppose the Greek *ἐπιόχεω*, and the Latin *jurare* to correspond, has quite another signification. For when we say in German, *der schwört*, he swears, it is uncertain whether it means he takes an oath, or blasphemes. The word is so indefinite that it may mean either. But the Latin *jurare* is used in a good sense, for taking a sacred oath, and for profane swearing *dejerare* is employed, which we express in German by *zuschweeren*, which properly squares with the Greek *ἐπιόχεω*. In Latin therefore there are three distinct words to express as many shades of thought, viz: *jurare*, *dejerare*, *pejerare*. The first signifies to affirm with an oath. The second to swear to any thing inconsiderately, whether true or false. The third to perjure one's self. Christ now does not forbid our taking a sacred oath, but only rash and frivolous swearing. The Anabaptists not seeing this difference, are willingly self-deceived. For Christ says—*ὅτι ἐπιόχεω*, that is *djeeres*, (for it is thus translated in ancient versions) where our translation has, *non perjurabis*, and not at all improperly; for whilst *perjurare* is never used in a good sense, it is not invariably used for taking a false oath, or falsifying, or speaking feignedly, but sometimes for frivolous profanity, (*dejerare*), i. e. when *dejerare* is used in a bad sense, which however we have observed is not always the case.—As to the words of Christ: "It hath been said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself," you will not find such a prohibition of perjury either in Hebrew or Greek. But in Exodus xx, you may find, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God rashly," or as our translation has it, *in vain*. Again Levit. xix, you have these words, "Thou shalt not swear falsely in my name;" where the Greek translation has it thus, *ὅτι ἀπείθεο τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐν ἁδίκῳ*, i. e. thou shalt not swear in my name to what is unjust or false; and the Latin version thus—*non perjurabis in nomine meo*. You can see therefore how elegantly D. Je-

rome uses *perjurare* for swearing falsely, not violating an oath. It was forbidden therefore among the ancients to take God's name in vain, that is, as is manifest from the passage in Leviticus, to swear to a falsehood. From this now it appears arose the opinion among the Jews, that if the name of God were adjured to the truth, there was no harm in it, although it might be done in daily and familiar conversation; but to something trivial, foolish, false or feigned, it was not permitted them to take the name of the Lord. Then they drew another false notion from these scriptural prohibitions, viz: that they only forbid the abuse of the name of *God*, but otherwise permitted swearing by heaven, or earth, or other creatures, neither reckoned it a sin if any one used such expressions, if only he did not speak falsely. These vain and false notions now, derived from the letter of the law improperly apprehended, Christ, the interpreter of the law, endeavors to remove from their minds, teaching them that they should not swear in their ordinary conversation either truly or falsely, either by the name of God, nor by those things which God has made, but that they should always so speak and act, that if they would say *yea*, or *nay* every one would be sufficiently persuaded of their veracity. But concerning an official or formal oath, there is clearly no mention here. The whole matter therefore stands thus: You have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself or take an oath. But I ask where is it said? There namely where not perjury is treated of, but the oath, it was allowed to invoke the name of God to the truth upon all occasions, which is the doctrine not of the divine law but of those who perverted it. It was said therefore among the ancients, not by God, but by those perverters of His law, who apprehended the spiritual law in a carnal way, and by others who interpreted it in a carnal sense. In Matthew it is added, "But render unto the Lord thy oaths." Whither does this lead if the former place ("Thou shalt not forswear thyself") is to be taken in the sense, "Thou shalt not violate thy oath? It follows therefore that those oaths are meant here in which any one promises *rashly* within himself to do something, even though in itself proper or lawful, which he would be solemnly bound to do if he had made an oath unto the Lord to that effect, seeing that (as is added parenthetically) "Thou must perform unto the Lord thine oaths;" in order that in this way persons may be deterred from swearing or adjuring, since there was danger that the Lord would hold them to their oath, even though it had been rashly taken. Then follows, "But I say unto you swear not at all." Mark then of what

kind of swearing he speaks, of that doubtless which the ancients supposed to be allowed them by their law, viz, to swear on ordinary occasions to some true and proper thing, by the name of God or something else. But Christ teaches them that in their common conversation they should neither swear, adjure, nor solemnly vow, in reference to any thing however true or worthy in itself. This view of His meaning is confirmed by what follows: "Neither by heaven, &c." From these examples it is manifest that Christ does not refer here to the formal or ceremonial oath. For what Hebrew ever thought of swearing in this formal manner, by heaven or earth, or any other creature? Who on the contrary was not daily accustomed to profane swearing by such things? It is this therefore that Christ forbids. This is the tenor of His whole discourse upon this point—"Let your communication be yea, &c." That is, if you would say yea, say simply yea, if nay, say simply nay. He speaks therefore of what should characterize their ordinary conversation, and not concerning the formal oath. And because this is not involved here, we add nothing further concerning it, having discussed it sufficiently in our Refutation of the Anabaptists, and there shown what is permitted to the Christian, and what pertains to godly piety. Christ therefore introduces nothing new into the law of His Father, but simply restores the ancient precept which had been made of no effect by human traditions. He forbids His followers to swear at all in the sense in which the ancients and pharisees allowed it; but He does not prohibit the taking of an oath according to the scriptures, for the glory of God, or the true advantage of others.

Quod ultra est, a malo est.—That is of the evil one, Satan. For in proportion as any one cultivates and loves the truth, will he become more like God. God is immutable, holy, infallible, pure, wherefore Christ calls Him the truth. By this interpretation of the law, Christ shows that we are evil, and that we are all sinners; for in God there can be no evil. So when he said above, "Whoso looketh on a woman, &c.," shows that evil is concealed in his heart. Wherever we perceive heat, we know the fire is not far off, and immediately apprehend a conflagration. But if the secret passions of others break forth into sinful acts, suffer not yours to do so. Flatter not yourself with self-complacent notions of your moral strength, but stand in the fear of God, watch and pray, that you fall not through temptation. There is, I confess, a difference between the passion and the act. The one sins in deed, the other only in feeling; but meanwhile this is a spark in the heart which, upon occasion may break out

into a flame. The teaching of Christ therefore amounts to this, that we candidly acknowledge our diseases, deplore them, and seek their remedy, and never indulge too strong a sense of security. Mendacity is the beginning of all sins. By falsehoods the serpent seduced our first parents. If therefore truth is planted and preached, and spread throughout the earth, justice, righteousness and every virtue will flourish. The preacher therefore who has this light of truth, in his heart, hand and mouth, sets it up in the midst of the Church. Then the wicked and ungodly, convicted in their consciences, are put to shame, when they hear the truth so constantly proclaimed by the preacher, and iniquity denounced. This will occur whenever the minister is faithful in discharging his duty, seeking neither his glory nor temporal gain, but desirous only of promoting the glory of God, and the good of men.—And what I say of the preacher of the gospel, may also apply to the civil judge. Truth is august, and full of majesty and awe even for the wicked. Where faith flourishes in the heart, there the fervor of true charity also burns, and there will be a strong desire to promote truth, justice and righteousness. Truth assists the judgment (for it is light), so that it immediately and easily detects falsehood in others, especially if the whole life has studied nothing but truth and justice. Zeal for the truth always discovers with ease the true merits of a cause. For where God illumines, how can there be darkness? If truth is every where restored, justice will soon be restored, and directly every virtue will most beautifully and delightfully flourish.

Praebeat ei et alteram.—This is a hyperbole, for Christ always adduces the most perfect examples. It has reference again to the internal man. We should bear injuries with patience, and be prepared indeed to bear even greater ones than those inflicted. The disciple of Christ must prepare himself, as long as he lives on earth, to endure with a noble and unruffled mind any evils that may befall him. For the world is prone to heap injuries upon the pious. Christ therefore admonishes us to imitate the Divine mind in this respect, although we may be unable fully to reach so perfect an example. This precept may aid us in our effort at self-knowledge, and the suppression of a revengeful spirit.

Diliges proximum, odio autem habebis inimicum.—This, so far as the letter is concerned, is found in the books of Moses concerning the extermination of the Canaanites and other gentile nations. As if Christ should say: "Thus indeed it was permitted by them of old times." But if we contemplate the

divine and absolute perfection, it will be found far more proper and agreeable to the Divine nature not to revenge an injury, even though you may be wronged and have it in your power to retaliate. Christ every where teaches us to suppress sinful affections, and places the impurity of them before our eyes. Thus he reiterates the words of the law : if the desires are impure, and any one seeks his own advantage, he violates the law. They who only regard the letter of the law are not just. Do you ask : will I then be righteous and holy if I act according to the spirit of the law ? By no means. Christ treats us all as guilty according to his law, and shows that we are deservedly condemned. And however impossible it may be for us to keep the law perfectly, He does not therefore cease to prescribe a perfect law for us, even though we may not attain to its fulfilment. God is most perfect and holy, and therefore lays upon His people a most perfect and holy law, and requires of them the highest perfection, even though they may not be capable of fully attaining thereto. He therefore constantly sets the most perfect examples before us, so that we may the better learn our imperfections and impurity. Whenever the spirit of God dwells in the heart, man rejoices and delights in the law.—Artizans, painters, sculptors do the same thing, always proposing the best examples to their pupils for their imitation, which they are nevertheless rarely if ever able to equal ; but meanwhile they must study, and strive again and again. Thus Christ would lead us to a proper knowledge of ourselves, that we may know how unholy and impotent we are, and learn how far short we come of the Divine perfections, and never flatter ourselves with self-righteous conceits, never indulge our vanity, or suppose we are sufficiently holy, but ever live in the fear of God, watching, praying, and imploring help from the Lord. To effect this, obedience to a most perfect law is required of us, even though we should never succeed in perfectly keeping it. Hence come that grief and groaning, those tears and prayers, yea that despair of the pious on account of their own works and merits, their own righteousness. Thus we learn to trust to the divine mercy alone of Him who gave His Son to die for us. His righteousness is our righteousness, He perfectly fulfilled the law for us, He made satisfaction to the Father for us, and restored us again to His Father's favor. Thus Christ uses many words when He teaches us to forgive and love our fellowmen ; few on the contrary, when he speaks of inflicting punishment, and this because we are naturally more prone to retaliation and revenge, than to compassion and love. Wherefore we may also learn here that our eyes should not be

always directed to the mere letter of the law and its outer shell, but that we should rather consider its more perfect import. It often happens that a person may be acquitted by the law, who nevertheless is not guiltless before God, since the divine laws are appointed for the maintenance of external intercourse and peace in ways of which the pious do not always avail themselves, even if they might do so, preferring rather to yield their rights to the advantage of others, than insist upon them for their own. They forgive therefore even though the law might allow them to demand redress, &c. They consider the difference between divine and human justice.

Diligete inimicos vestros, nam si eos dilexeritis.—Christ does not by any means forbid here our recompensing those who may do us good, but simply that doing so cannot be claimed as an evidence of having attained to perfection. If you do nothing more towards those who benefit you than the ungodly and unbelievers do, you are still very far from perfect righteousness, and the nature of your heavenly Father, who does good even to the wicked.

Let us now sum up what has been said, in concluding this chapter. In the perfection of the law which God prescribes for us we see our spiritual impotency, imperfection and impurity as in a glass. For we may learn how wicked, on the one hand, are all hypocritical pretences of keeping the law, whether we make them for vain glory, gain, or under the influence of other evil affections, and on the other how condemnable it is to neglect and despise the law. At the best we are miserable sinners, even when we act under the incitements of the Divine Spirit, and in the exercise of faith; for our best works are always defective. For even though we may strive in true faith, we can never meet the full demands of so perfect a law. Our righteousness must therefore remain defective, imperfect, and impure, until by faith we apprehend and appropriate the righteousness of Christ.

Easton, Pa.

J. H. A. B.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, AND THE BAPTISTIC QUESTION.

Translated from the German of Dr. Martensen.

II. INFANT BAPTISM.

WE have the conception of Infant Baptism in the relation of Baptism to faith, which has been developed in the previous Section. If faith be the fruit of baptism, then every baptism, whether performed on adults or children, is, in its conception, an infant baptism. If now, it can be shown that this apprehension of the relation of baptism to faith has its ground in the Scripture, then it is also shown that infant baptism is founded in Scripture. To ask any other scripture proof than this is an unhistorical demand. For it is of itself clear, that in that period when planting the church was the real mission, many things must needs have taken a different form, than in succeeding times, when the church had taken firm root in the world, and when the kingdom of God has become nature. Thus baptism, although its sacramental essence, and its fundamental relation to faith, must ever be the same, must come forward in another form when the kingdom of God is to be extended through missions—where it is introduced into the public mind from without—than where it is to be spread through the medium of an already existing *inhabitation*; where it inhabits the public mind, and is to unfold from within outwardly its world-transforming powers.

Where the kingdom of God is planted through missions, baptism must appear principally as adult baptism, because the existence of a mother church is the fundamental condition of a really blessed use of infant baptism. Since now the Holy Scriptures are written most directly from the missionary standpoint, where it was the more immediate mission of the apostles to establish the mother church, without which the baptism of infants, which is inseparable from Christian nurture, would have been a meaningless work, it cannot be reasonably asked that positive commands to baptize infants should be found in the Scriptures; still less so, since it is not merely the letter but the spirit which is to bring us to a correct understanding and use of the Divine institutions. The silence of the Scriptures in regard to infant baptism can therefore by no means set it aside, unless we deny all force to the spirit of the Scriptures, and go by the rule that not only all is true which is in the Scripture, but that nothing is true but what is contained in the letter of the Scrip-

ture. Without therefore seeking literal references to infant baptism, and appealing to such passages as Mark x: 14, 15, 1 Cor. vii: 14, 1 Cor. i: 16, &c., we will confine ourselves to the proof that the relation between baptism and faith, which we have developed in the previous section, is grounded in Scripture.

If now we consider the Saviour's own declarations in regard to baptism, we find the first in Matth. xxviii: 19-20. Here we find that the Lord gave to his disciples, in whom he himself had founded faith, and whom he had elected to plant faith in the world, the command: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." In the exposition of this passage we must repeat, what has often been remarked, that the common translation, Go ye and "teach" all nations, &c., is not entirely correct. That word, in the text, which has been translated "teach," has a far more comprehensive signification, viz: to "make them to disciples." To become disciples of Christ means not merely to receive his teachings, but to be personally united with him. Hence it is afterwards said in strict accordance with the original: "teaching" them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." If, now, we observe these words of Scripture it is evident, in the first place, that *all nations* are to be made into disciples. Since, according to this declaration, not merely small conventicles, but large national masses are to be discipled, it plainly points out the universality of election in the most definite manner, and excludes all particularism. Secondly, it is plain also, that the general command to make disciples includes both baptizing and teaching, so that the church, if she will in all time remain faithful to the Lord's command, must, as the Saviour has done, place baptism first, teaching and the self-conscious life of faith second. This also the church has done from the beginning, but the complete realization of the Lord's command, even in reference to the outward form of baptism, can only find place where infant baptism is introduced. The more infant baptism becomes general in the world, the more completely will the words of the Lord be fulfilled, which commands that the *nations* shall be discipled by baptism and teaching.

Again, we read in Mark xvi: 15-16: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that be-

lieth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This passage, which evidently lays chief stress upon faith, may in a superficial view, seem Baptistic. If however we deduce from this passage the well-grounded proposition, that bare baptism does not save—yea, if we, in accordance with other declarations of Scripture, correctly teach that faith only saves, have we then contradicted what this and the previous passage plainly presupposes, namely, that baptism is that *means of grace* through which faith is at first truly established? No. On the contrary, the more livingly it is acknowledged, that salvation and damnation have their source in the depth of freedom, in faith and unbelief, so much the more significance has the question, How may weak and sinful man attain to saving faith?—so much more significance must be attached to that divine grace, through which Christ himself aids man to the attainment of faith. Hence, in the passage quoted, Christ says: Only faith, a free, deep giving up of ourselves, saves; but no one can believe unless I myself give him faith. Therefore he does not merely say, He that *believeth*, but he that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved. Of course, in those who are admitted to mission-baptism there must be present a preliminary receptivity, an inclination of the spirit towards Christ. This beginning of faith, however, is related to that which has its source in the institution of the Lord and the living fullness of the church, only like shadow to substance, like longing to fulfilment.

If we may gather from the Acts of the Apostles that the apostolical mission has in a certain sense made baptism to presuppose faith, the principal question still is how this faith was regarded by the Apostles. Apostolic baptism was not a forced baptism; and a mission, for instance, like the well-known Saxon mission of Charles the Great, is without any apostolical ground. But just as little is apostolic baptism Baptistic; which is, in the history of the church, the opposite extreme of compulsory baptism. A glance at the apostolic practice shows conclusively, that the apostles regarded no one as regenerated before he was baptized, but that they demanded of those to be baptized only the general susceptibility, not a finished faith in the kingdom of God. The expression "believe," when it comes forward in Scripture in this connection, designates therefore rather the wish for, and the longing after, faith, than faith itself. Had the Apostles been Baptists, and had they regarded it as necessary that no one should be baptized unless he actually believed and was born again, their whole practice would have been different. How

entirely differently, from what we know was the case, would they have had to examine the applicants for baptism in all the most insignificant details? Were the Baptist theory, that baptism may only be granted to those already regenerated, correct, then the Apostles must be charged with unpardonable indiscretion, because they forthwith and without hesitation admitted whole hosts to baptism; whereas they should, with the utmost caution, have taken each one separately, instructed, prepared and proved him, in order to be fully convinced that he really stood in faith. For we are not warranted in making the Apostles heart searchers, and to suppose them to have had the supernatural gift of seeing into the souls of those individuals with whom they had to do, although the Baptists sometimes have recourse to this evasion. On the contrary, the apostolic practice is consistent on the principle which presupposes that the personal life of faith only begins truly by means of baptism, and that accordingly, as a preliminary to baptism, there is necessary only a general susceptibility for the kingdom of God. It is only under this supposition that the practice of the Apostles becomes intelligible, when they join the baptism, both of individuals and of whole masses, immediately with their awakening; whereas the Baptists, to be consistent, must defer baptism, until the evidence of regeneration is placed beyond all doubt.¹

If, as a final resort, the Baptist theory seeks to strengthen itself by such passages as Acts x: 44, where it is related that the Holy Spirit, *before* baptism, fell upon those who heard the word, we reply that that passage refers only to a general awakening, and not a real regeneration. The operations of the Spirit, which manifested themselves in this instance, consisted in this, that Pagans who were arrested by the apostolic preaching fell into an extatic condition, and spoke with tongues, a manifestation of spiritual conviction which was common in the apostolic age, and analogous to which much is exhibited in the periods of awakening which followed. This speaking with tongues was the expression of the mighty movings of spiritual powers in the depths of the soul, the streaming out of the first, as yet irregular, outbreathing of spiritual energy, which had more the character of an exalted natural condition, than of clear conscious-

¹ Hoffman's "Baptism and Re-baptism." Luther already called attention to this point—to this deferring of baptism to an indefinite period, which re-baptism necessarily involves; so that baptism, strictly taken on the ground of this theory, can never be performed, because it can never arrive at an absolute certainty as to the condition of the subject.

ness, and which could therefore only attain to its true significance by passing over into the divinely constituted order of the church, and by being taken up into the historical process of evolution which characterizes God's kingdom. Had this extatic condition, in an isolated way, been adhered to, it would have manifested itself only in the promotion of confusion and fanaticism, as has been shown in every period of awakening, where religious nature-powers have not been brought under a churchly organization. Hence this special gift of the Spirit only reached its true significance through baptism, which the general gifts of grace presuppose—those gifts of grace which are to be continued in the church, and which belong to the sober and considerate historical life of the Christian; those, namely, of faith, and hope, and love.

If, farther, the Baptist system would stay itself upon Rom. x: 17, that faith comes by hearing, it will be remembered that we have, in the previous section, treated in a general way of the sense in which that passage is to be taken. Here we remark more particularly, that the apostle in the determining context of the passage is considering the world-relation of the mission of Christianity, and in this connection understands by faith only the willing reception of the Gospel, which he places in contrast with that hardening rejection of it which he complains of as existing among the Jews. But the same Apostle, when he looks out upon the church in the process of development, clearly derives the beginning of the life of faith, the participation in the death and resurrection of Christ, from baptism; and sees, in baptism, a "laver of regeneration," and the revelation of the eternal love and mercy of God towards man, Rom. vi: 4, Col. iii: 4, 6. Further, where another apostle calls baptism "the answer of a good conscience toward God," 1 Pet. iii: 21, and the Baptist system attempts to show from this that baptism is only a moral agreement between men and God, then let it be considered, that the whole context shows, that the apostle grounds the obligations of baptism in its promises, and that he considers it as the "answer of a good conscience," in so far only as he regards it, at the same time, as the "laver of regeneration," and attributes to it a "saving" significance.

Hence, if the apostolical mission, excludes the Baptist theory of baptism, just as well as its opposite, compulsory baptism, then the peculiar substance of apostolic baptism must rest upon the peculiar relation between baptism and that receptivity, of which a compulsory mission makes no account, whilst the Baptist system maintains its necessity in an unlimited way. If,

now, we say, that the receptivity, which apostolic baptism presupposes in adults, is, in its conception, none other than a receptivity for the kingdom of God which is already to be found in the child, the knowledge of this is not to be reached certainly by stopping in the fact of baptism, but only by descending into its interior nature. The more profoundly the church enters into the dogma of baptism, and thus into the biblical and Christian fundamental truths of the world and the kingdom of God, nature and grace, original sin and salvation, of the fall of our race in the first Adam, and its restoration in the second Adam, the more clearly will the perception come to a full consciousness that the baptism of adults, in its true conception, is an infant baptism. It lies in the Christian view of sin and redemption, as this has reached its classic development in Paul, Augustine, and Luther, that the opposition between the old and the new man, as it comes to view in baptism, is not merely a moral opposition, not the opposition of two processes of the development of moral freedom, but the opposition of two NATURES, unfolding themselves from two important grounds, which lie behind all development, and behind all moral life and action. Not single sinful actions of man are to be destroyed by baptism; but the possibility of all sinful actions, the sinfulness of the race, the depraved nature of man is to be broken by means of baptism, in order that his sinful nature may not be a hindrance to his salvation. And the new, which is to be brought into existence in baptism, is not a definite degree of holiness and of moral perfection, an implantation into the body of the new-created human race. In baptism, therefore, we are not most immediately concerned with the *person*, but with the *nature*; not with the finished *I*, but with the process of becoming, with the birth of an *I*; not with freedom, but with the active natural conditions of true freedom. In the other view, baptism must presuppose freedom as inward possibility, as receptivity for its gracious gifts. But the receptivity which baptism presupposes, is not a receptivity for this or that single gift of grace, which refers to one definite stage of conscious development: not a receptivity for one of the many special graces, which is bound down to one definite activity in the Christian communion-life. It is merely the general susceptibility for the new creation, and is therefore, in its conception, not yet an actual personal receptivity, because it has not yet specified itself as receptivity for any one special grace. The receptivity of which we speak is not the expression of a peculiar natural aptitude in the individual, which may lead to peculiar grace. It can only be considered as the general sus-

ceptibility of human nature for Christ; as its possibility of being redeemed and perfected in the direction of its destiny. And in this it differs from that receptivity which is presupposed in the Lord's Supper. The holy Supper is a believing reception and enjoyment of a personal communion with Christ; it establishes a real reciprocation between Christ and the believer. Baptism on the other hand is not reception of, but a divine consecration to faith. Therefore the receptivity which the holy Supper presupposes is one already specified and defined, since it is only found with such as have already attained a definite grade of the communion-life; and which seek, in the use of the sacrament, a strengthening of their personal life of faith, to the end that each one may be individually glorified in the love of Christ and of the church. But the receptivity, which is presupposed in baptism, can only be regarded as purely general, slumbering as yet in the personal peculiarity of the individual; and in this indefinite, twilight-like generality, it can only be comprehended negatively. First of all, it manifests itself in this, that the baptized one do not withstand or resist the grace; and we can here appropriately adopt the catholic formula: "*obicem non ponere.*" This, however, must not be regarded merely as dead careless passiveness, for no receptivity can be destitute of all activity. Although we cannot, of course, regard this activity as a personal one, which would confound the relation of the person to baptism with his relation to the holy Supper, we must nevertheless regard it as a *living* activity; and this active moment in the indefinite receptivity we designate as the "bent or bias to the kingdom of God," which constitutes the divine in human nature, but which can only be formed, unfolded into a personal *will*, and rendered truly ethical, in an actual communion with Christ and the Church. But that receptivity which thus belongs to or flows from the conception of baptism, is just the same which is found with the child. For just as the bent or bias of this world moves in the child from its birth, so also does the bent or inclination to the kingdom of God move in the nature of the infantile life; and as the human nature in the child is averted from God and diverted to the world, so does also that nature contain the dark earnest longing of the creature after Christ. In substance it is therefore also this receptivity which must be required in the adult subject of baptism, because it only, in this way, agrees with the true conception of baptism. But that receptivity which is originally in the child must first be waked up in the adult, which is done when his old world passes away, and he is brought to that point where he despairs of him-

self, and seeks a new foundation for his life. The adult subject of baptism cannot, in reference to redemption and the kingdom of God, appear as an independent personality; the steps of development in his moral life, to which he has attained, his acts and works, which he has accomplished in the civil communion-life of his nation, are, over against baptism, a vanishing quantity; for the reason, that the conceptions of duty and virtue, of communion-life and moral actings, only receive their true signification and importance where baptism has gone before—only have their true reality in Christ and the Church, in the kingdom of spiritual gifts. Since, therefore, he must thus look away from his actual personality, and forgetting that which is behind, must seek to begin his life anew, he places himself, in reference to redemption and the kingdom of God, upon a level with the child which is to be born into the new world of Christianity. Although he in reality differs from the child, yet his relation to baptism is in substance the same. This will become clear when we view the adult subject of baptism, not only from the stand-point of redemption, but also from the stand-point of sin. For, as he must be viewed in regard to grace or the idea of goodness, not according to his actual personality, but according to the possibility in him of attaining to a new personality; so also, in reference to sin, he must not judge himself according to his actual sins—which would be but a superficial view of sin—but he must go back to the origin of his sinful self-consciousness, to his Adamic nature, to his birth. The main problem of Christian missionary preaching must therefore be this, to bring the heathen or Jewish subject of baptism to such a consciousness of sin that it shall be possible for him to place himself on a level with the infant—a demand, which according to the teaching of Scripture, appeared already to Nicodemus such a great paradox, (John iii: 4) because he could not escape from his personal *I*, from his Scripture-wise, legal self-consciousness, from his acts and works,—because he has not as yet a correct idea of the sinfulness of the *race*, and consequently also no correct idea of the sinfulness of *his own nature*. This consciousness of the necessity of salvation gives, according to the principles of the apostolic mission, admission to baptism—a consciousness, which need not be present clearly in the thoughts of the subject; yea, which cannot even be so present, but which only makes itself valid practically in the form of feeling. Where now, the doctrine of general sinfulness, and of general salvation in Christ is gladly received, so that the hearers willingly permit themselves to be baptized, as we see it described in so many places in the Acts of

the Apostles, there the bent towards the kingdom of God has come to an actual issue, and the old self and the old world can not hinder baptism from becoming what, in its conception, it must become, an infant baptism. Since therefore the idea of infant baptism is always hovering before the Christian mission, it is plain that infant baptism stands most directly opposed both to Baptistic and to compulsory baptism; because namely, both these forms of baptism in fact deny the identity of adult and infant baptism. Both extremes meet and agree in this, that they hold fast to the idea that in baptism they have a finished and definite personality—only with this difference that the Baptistic theory regards this finished self (*Ich*) as a new man which has already attained to a definite stage of moral perfection; on the other hand the compulsory baptism regards this finished self as an old man, which has already established himself in the worldly consciousness, in which he has awakened, and now offers, a natural resistance to that which would drive him out of that position. Both mistake in this way, forgetting that not a finished self, but one beginning, a germinating self is to be baptized, or that the baptism of adults is an infant baptism: the Baptistic theory, because it improperly *defers* baptism, and proposes only to baptize a full-born new man; the compulsory mission, because it makes too great *haste* with baptism, and seeks to baptize an old man rooted in heathenism or Judaism, without allowing to itself time to awaken in him that receptivity which sets aside the natural resistance of the heart, and makes it possible for him to receive the kingdom of God as a little child. Since both these extremes mistake the substance of baptism, they both become defective executors of the divine purpose; for while the Baptistic theory, in baptism, attributes to human subjectivity such a significance, that it makes, in substance, baptism but an act of the individual freedom, instead of an act of Christ, the compulsory mission pays no respect whatever to individual freedom. It considers the persons to be baptized, not as subjects, but only as substrata for baptism; and while it accomplishes baptism with sword in hand, this baptism has so little the character of being the execution of a divine gracious election, that it comes upon the nations rather as a fate. The divine decree, therefore, receives its true execution, neither where baptism appears as a work of Baptistic arbitrariness, nor yet where it appears as a work of fate; but only where creating grace lays the ground for human freedom. Freedom must therefore be presupposed in baptism; but since it is presupposed as that freedom which is yet to be established, it must be presupposed only as

possibility, as bias or inclination towards the kingdom of God. In virtue therefore of her doctrine of the universality of grace, the Church is justified, and it is her duty, to baptize children in every place where mother-churches are established, and it would be absurd to continue missionary baptism in the bosom of the Church, instead of turning it into the form of infant baptism.

Only when baptism is made to hold its place in its form of infant baptism, can the operations of baptism completely unfold themselves, since then the whole life can appear as a divine growth in Christ. The conception of *following Christ* only reaches its full signification through infant baptism. In order that the perfection of Christ may penetrate, with fructifying power, every natural stage in the history of human life, baptism must be conferred in the beginning of life. The direct antipode of this, is the error of deferring baptism to the end of life; an error, by the way, which is backed by distinguished authority, as Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor, gave it the force of his own example. This notion proceeds upon the supposition, that by deferring baptism to the farthest point, the subject may secure to himself a Christian, that is, a blessed death. It is not remembered, however, that a Christian death only attains its true significance through the Christian life which precedes it. But the Christian life begins, according to the divine order, like Christ's own life, with infancy. In this, that the God-man himself was a child, that he increased in wisdom and grace, that his whole life and actions were nothing else than the free development of the divine fulness which slumbered in the child—in this lies clearly the fact that the human nature may be united with the divine, not only at a certain stage of its conscious development, but in its inmost ground, *previous* to all consciousness. What the child Christ, is, in his original nature, that all the children of men are to become, by grace; and the childhood of Christ would have been useless, if it were not possible to change the Adamic infant nature into the image of the child Christ. To reject infant baptism, upon the ground that the period of infancy, on account of its innocence, does not need the Saviour, is Pelagian. This denies the universal depravity of human nature, and regards the infancy of Christ as redundant, and of no meaning, in the work of redemption. If, on the other hand, we take in earnest the dogma of sin and natural depravity, and yet nevertheless defer baptism until later life, because redemption cannot begin to work upon the child, and because it is supposed that its operations can only begin later in life—this is a Manichean conception of infancy; for, in this

case, a period of human life is designated, in which, although it is subject to the general defection of sin, it is, according to this conception, excluded from the system of redemption, and from the communion of Christ. In this way vanishes the heavenly glory from the infancy of Christ. The reality of the incarnation is denied, and we are carried back into the old heretical conception, that the divinity only then united itself with Christ, when self-conscious thoughts had arisen in his soul. It is therefore clear, that where infant baptism is denied, there also are the most important fundamental truths of Christianity, concerning the human and divine nature, denied. But where these truths have been in a living way appropriated; where, namely, a Christian family-life has been constituted, there also was the child, which was born in the bosom of the family, regarded as holy, (1 Cor. vii: 14); that is, not as one which is already holy by natural birth, but as one which is destined to become holy through baptism.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

CHURCH SKEPTICISM.¹

WITH great propriety does the "Holy Catholic Church" follow the Trinity as an article of our faith in that wondrous mirror of Christian consciousness the Apostles' Creed. We might say with equal necessity also;* for without it there can be no proper faith in the incarnation as such, in which the whole mystery of the Trinity is involved and through which alone it has been revealed to the world; and Christianity, being by this means separated from the incarnation as its central ground, must lose all reality, or at least all *distinctive character*, becoming a religion of doctrine merely, and differing from Mohammedanism only in its more elevated tone of morality, or from Judaism only in its greater fulness of inspiration.

An *actualization* is as necessary on the one hand to that Christ-life which is revealed in the incarnation, as the incarnation is on the other to its revelation. Of course this Christ-life *was* completely actualized in its revelation; yet not in the sense of having gone forth as a living power, or as having actualized itself by bringing into its own organism the whole world which had become regenerated by it. The very assumption of fallen humanity upon the part of the *Word* was, in Christ's person, its redemption and regeneration; for he assumed it, not to sin with it, but to redeem it, and in this very act is centered the full redemptive power and efficacy of his person.* So we can say,

¹ This article is part of a somewhat extended discussion, called forth originally by a private controversy; an explanation, which may serve to account particularly for the disproportionate length of the notes.

* Cum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignorentur, *necessario adjicitur Ecclesiae mentio*, quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quae trium corpus est (Tertullian de Baptis. c. 6, as quoted by Bishop Pearson). In those symbols, where the Church does not immediately follow the third person of the Trinity, the separation is merely grammatical, and not essential, and generally in fact the Church is put at the conclusion ("*per sanctam Ecclesiam*," cum emphasi), only to show that all the previously mentioned supernatural gifts and powers are lodged in her constitution (see Pearson on the Creed, Art. IX).

² This position is, in the main, we acknowledge, contradicted by J. D. Morell. We have Christianity in its objective phase defined by him in his "Philosophy of Religion" p. 123, as "that religion which rests upon the consciousness of the redemption of the world through Jesus Christ." Two conceptions, as the author himself acknowledges, are here brought into view, the one that of redemption, the other that of a *personal Redeemer* (what the author means by a *personal Redeemer* seems to be a single individual being, without any reference to the peculiar constitution of his per-

that in Him the redemption of the world is actualized, as its fall was in Adam; yet we do mean by this, that his personal life has gone forth into the world and actually Christianized every element of its life, but only, that in the incarnation we find the *realized possibility* of this historical process, and the absolute necessity of its actualization, as a *life power*, in the world. Indeed the very element of all life power is *concretion*, and every living process abhors a dualism as much as nature a vacuum. There is no such thing in the world of nature, mind, or spirit, as a *formless idea*, nor can there be properly speaking any such thing as an *idealess form*. Referring Christianity (as we shall hereafter show to be necessary) to the person of Christ for its distinctive character as life, we find that from its very nature it must take up organically into itself and completely redeem the life of the world. This constitutes in its *idea* the very *type* of its process, and the peculiar *plasticity* of its power. As the law of all growth is the development of a central point of evolution, in which the whole possible existence is contained, and the

son). Now, with a proper view of Christ's person, there is no possibility of separating the idea of redemption from a *personal Redeemer*. Here alone can it, in its complete universality, be reached. In the person of Christ only is that life lodged which is our redemption. Here not only the redeeming power, but the redemption itself centres * * * "ascendere in altitudinem offerentem et commendantem patri eum hominem, qui fuerat inventus, primitias resurrectionis hominis in semetipso faciens" ("Iren. adv. Haer. Lib. iii. c. xxi). "I am the resurrection and the life." In me, not by me as a separate operation, the world, its whole process centering in generic humanity, is reconciled to God and by God. Holding this view, there is no possibility of conceiving with the author, that by referring Christianity for its distinctive character to the person of Christ, it would become merely a *form of religious worship*, introduced by Him without any necessary reference to the redemption of the world. This would be the case of course, were Christ as a *personal Redeemer* merely a man, a prophet like Moses, or a fabricator of religion like Mohammed, or a second Adam only. But there is far deeper significance in his person than all this. *In him* generic fallen humanity is already Christianized and redeemed, and out of his person there can be no redemption whatever, and also no proper humanity. As the incarnation implies, *he* is the concrete God-man, and in this concretion, and no where else rests the very conception of Christianity. Lutheranism, for example, may be simply the peculiar doctrines of Luther, as far impersonated as possible and reduced to practice; but Christianity is connected in no such way to Christ. As Coleridge aptly remarks somewhere in his *Aids to Reflection*, "we do not believe Christ, but believe in Christ;" that is, we do not follow the doctrines of Christ as our leader, but partake of him. "I in you, and you in me," is the Saviour's language. Christianity is *his life*, not what he taught or did in his life, but the Christ-life itself. Not our life of faith, but the life of our faith—its appropriated contents.

whole form prefigured, so Christianity, as historical and evolving itself from Christ's person, can never go out of or beyond that person as constituting its life giving and normative ground.* As humanity can never cease to be Adamic, so neither can Christianity cease to be Christly. If then Christianity thus receives its character from Christ's person, it must of necessity bear along in its constitution his personal life, and that personal life from the very fact of the incarnation, as we shall endeavor to show, must organically take up into itself the life of the world.

Indeed were there no such organic process of actualization, commencing with the person of Christ as its ground and starting point, the incarnation would evidently be shorn of all true significance and force, and by ceasing to be continuous would become a plain contradiction, as its own nature is the sure evidence of its continuity. It is absurd, for example, to believe in an *incarnation*, and at the same time imagine that it can resolve itself into an *escarnation*, and become either pure spirit or pure nature. There is no necessity at all for forcing our faith so far out of itself, as to make us believe that Christ operates with only *ex-officio* power and in *ex-officio* style, or that he now stands far aloof from the world, having torn himself asunder from that humanity with which he once entered into organic union. The incarnation, to give it any reality, must have entered with all its peculiar organizing force into the very life-constitution of the world, as a permanent fact; permanent, yet not inactive, as an event or phenomenon recorded and thence remembered; but permanent *in its activity*, that is, ever moving forward with all the life-unfolding energies of an idea, and never ceasing its process or operation until the conception upon which it rests is fully and historically realized. Now in as much as its own force rests upon the organic union of the human and divine, its history of course must be the development and revelation of its power in the same organic way; not bringing us into God however, so as to make us Christ (*καὶ Χριστός*), but bringing us into Christ's personal life, so that Christianity may fully complete and realize humanity, and God in Christ reconcile the world unto himself (*Θεὸς ὃν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀπομὲν παρὰλλασσεν^{*} αὐτοῦ 2 Cor. v: 19*), thus making us Christ's (*πάντες ἐν ἐν Χριστῷ*) and thereby God's (*ἡμεῖς δὲ Χρισ-*

* In this sense we have used the word *idea*, and more in accordance with its proper meaning we think.

^{*} *παρὰ-ἄλλας*.—The prepositional prefix, and the verbal termination also, render this word very emphatic—a thorough change.

τον Χριστός δι Θεου 1 Cor. iii : 23). This being the case, it is plain that the Church, as this process of actualization, perfect and complete in the person of Christ, and thence going forth as the power of his personal and supernatural life (Ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστίν ὁ καταβαίνων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζῶν διδούς τῷ κόσμῳ John vi : 33),⁷ and completing itself in history by incorporating into its own constitution the life of the world, (John xv : 3-5), that life centering in humanity, and there elevated to consciousness; it is plain, we say, that the Church, as thus embodying the vast organic movement of the universe (καθ' ὅλην) toward Christ,⁸ is as absolutely necessary to a proper faith in the incarnation on the one hand, as the incarnation is to its existence on the other. They are inseparably linked together.⁹ Their connection is vital and organic. Form and contents, body and soul, inter-

⁷ We find here, and indeed throughout this whole gospel, that the true relation between the life of humanity, which is the life of the world, and that of Christ, is that of an organic incorporation of the former by and in that of the latter. Coalescence and incorporation are the terms which Calvin ever employs, in this connection.

⁸ αἱ οὐρανίαι τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῶν καιρῶν ἀνακεφαλαιωσάσαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Eph. i : 10). This is a brief, yet clear and powerful, exposition of the Church's process and destiny. She is considered as containing in herself all history. The law of her progress is the *home-law* (οἰκονομία) of the full realization of all tendencies (τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῶν καιρῶν). In her inward constitution all things (τὰ πάντα with the article more properly the whole, the *universe*) are reconciled to God in Christ. Here all previous tendencies are recapitulated, unified, substantiated and realized. Here the world is freely and organically taken up into Christ's life—born again by the Spirit into the resurrection life of Christ; who, in his own resurrection, was the first fruits of man's resurrection. The history of the Church is thus made the history of history, the central ground whence all other processes take their position and significance. She records not the events of the world's separate life, but the very birth travails of her regeneration to a new life, and the truth revealings of her new awakened and ever widening consciousness. Irenaeus writes very forcibly in reference to this recapitulatory process: "Unus igitur Deus Pater quemadmodum ostendimus et unus Christus Jesus Dominus noster veniens per universam dispositionem et omnia in semetipso recapitulans in omnibus autem est, et homo plasmatio Dei, et hominem ergo in semetipso recapitulatus est, invisibilis visibilis factus, et incomprehensibilis factus comprehensibilis, et impassibilis passibilis, et verbum homo, universa in semetipso recapitulans, uti sicut in supercoelestibus et spiritualibus et in visibilibus et corporalibus principatum habeat in semetipsum primatum assumens et apponens semetipsum apto in tempore" (Iren. adv. Haer. Lib. iii. c. xxiii). Calvin also: "denique sine Christo totus mundus est quasi deforme chaos et horrenda confusio. Solus ipse nos colligit in veram unitatem" (Calv. Com. on New Tes.).

⁹ ὁμοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ Χριστοῦ ἰσοσύ ἐστὶν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία (Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrna. c. 8).

penetrate and live in each other, and the Church is thus the living actual embodiment of the incarnate mystery. Divide them, and the incarnation becomes a merely transient phenomenon, with no permanent or continuous force for the world or man; and the church, instead of being the body and fulness of Christ, proves itself but a lifeless empty corpse. If the life-power of Christ's person does not enter into the very constitution of the Church, it is of no efficacy to the world. If his life-blood does not circulate through her every artery and vein, it becomes stagnant and destitute of all vivific power for his people. If the Church, as the mother of us all, has no living wedlock with Christ, we are but bastard sons and daughters, with no legitimate prospect of the inheritance. Hence we say that the church with equal propriety and necessity follows the incarnation as an article of our faith in the Creed.

Mysterious in her constitution, which is leavened with the active power of Christ's incorruptible and supernatural life, her nature and mission can only be perceived and felt by faith. God must be in Christ reconciling the world unto himself by the Holy Ghost, in the Church, which is Christ's body, in which we are united in the closest communion as members of each other and of him from whom we thus receive full forgiveness in our complete at-one-ment, and that life which is our resurrection and our everlasting life.

This leads us to examine somewhat more closely, before discussing the nature of the Church, the doctrine of the incarnation, holding as it does such a central position in that "regula fidei," the substance of which we have just given. We shall do this first in a historical way, showing how it has been apprehended and established by the early Church.⁹ Our point here, is not to determine what may be termed the ground of the incarnation, involved in the question "Cur Deus Homo," but only to show that its full force as real and redemptive, and as apprehended by the Church, rests upon the peculiar constitution of Christ's person as the organic union of the human and divine. In this union we shall endeavor to find that central point of evolution, which is essentially necessary to constitute Christiani-

⁹ *THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION* (Ephes. v. 31-32).

¹⁰ There would be no necessity of pursuing this course, did not both the modern Arian and Gnostic spirit ostensibly parade the christology and church-thought of this period in its favor; in a manner entirely inconsistent and unjust however, and without at all recognizing their true force and consequence.

ty a single organic life-process. This position in itself is by no means chargeable with heresy; for what we have said already will guard against the supposition, that we support such a synthesis of the two natures that in the *composite nature* they lose their *distinctive character*. There is no composite nature in the case whatever, neither can there be.¹¹ As in Christianity, humanity loses not its own nature, but on the contrary finds its own proper idea realized; so it is not the *nature* of Christ, whether human or divine, or both, which is operative, but his *personal life*. He sustains a different relation to the race in this respect than the first Adam. He is humanity's *quickenings spirit*, not its *nature-giving* but its *life-giving* power. The human and divine must be *distinctly* present, it is true, in the constitution of his person, before he can be the resurrection and the life of the world; yet being distinctly present so as not to form a synthetic or composite *φύσις* by no means destroys the possibility of a single *υπόστασις*.¹² There is indeed an absolute necessity of some central ground of union, some *ἑνωσις* in Christ's person, or the *incarnation* is nothing more than an *inspiration* and the personal I of Christ a falsehood. Christ must be a concrete God-man, or the world's redemption remain a problem as yet unsolved, and all history a *nihil* as yet without aim or revelation. This new single Christ *υπόστασις*, which proves itself to have been necessary, differs from that of the Father, the Holy Ghost, or man,¹³ and introduces into the world by virtue of its nature an entirely new and distinct order of life of which it is itself of course the source and type. This, as we have said, the incarnation implies an renders necessary as being itself the direct introduction of new supernatural and permanent forces into the

¹¹ Ἀρετῆς; γὰρ καὶ ἀναλλοιωτῶς ηὐρέθησαν ἀλλήλαις αἱ φύσεις ἡντὲς τῆς θείας φύσεως ἐκπαύσεως τῆς οὐκείας ἀλογητός, ἡντὲς μὴν τῆς ἀνθρώπινης ἢ τρανείας εἰς ἀλογητὸς φῶναι ἢ εἰς ἀντορξίαν χωρησάσης, ἡντὲς ἐκ τῶν δύο μίας γαγενήμενης συνθετοῦ φύσεως, ἢ δὲ συνθετοῦ φύσεως αὐτῶν ὁπότερα τῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν συνθετῶν φύσεων ὁμοιωτικῶς ὑπαρξέιν δύναται (Damas. de Orth. Fid. Lib. iii. cap. iii. Basileae, 1548). This was clearly established by the council of Chalcedon, over against the Eutychian heresy, six hundred and thirty fathers being present.

¹² Ἐντέθεν οὐκ ἑνὴν εἰπὴν μίαν φύσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συγκεκμημένου, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ θεότητος καὶ ἀνθρώπιότητος . . . but the union is κατὰ συνθετοῦ, ἡγὼν καὶ ὑποστάσιν ἀρετῆς καὶ ἀσυνεχίας καὶ ἀναλλοιωτῶς καὶ ἀδιατάκτου, καὶ ἐν δύο φύσεσι τελείως ἐκχωρούσαις μίαν ὑπόστασιν (Damas. de. Orth. Fid. Lib. iii. cap. iii). This was established by the council of Ephesus over against the Nestorian heresy.

¹³ Ὑποστάσιν γὰρ αἱ φύσεις αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει μίαν ὑποστάσιν συνθετοῦ σχοῦσαι καὶ ἢ διαφέρει τὸν τε πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὴν τε μητέρα καὶ ἑαυτὴν (Dam. de. Orth. Fid. p. 194).

constitution of the world's life; and there seems to have been also an adaptation if not necessity both on the part of God and man for it.¹⁴

Before entering, however, into an examination of the doctrine of the incarnation as held by the early Church, it may be proper to show by a few remarks that the subject is by no means important in a speculative way only, but pregnant with practical application and force. All christological research it is true must be based upon the declaration of the Apostle: "Great is the mystery of Godliness—God manifest in the flesh;" and therefore however close and severe such research may be, it can never exhaust the mystery which lies at its foundation. But this is the case with all the articles of our faith. Their region is the spiritual and supernatural world, unto which we have no access by reason or sense, but by faith alone. This however does not rob them of worth or importance, but rather gives to them deeper significance and reality; for they address themselves immediately to the deepest ground of our being. As Leighton beautifully remarks: "Faith elevates the soul not only above sense and sensible things, but above reason itself," and humanity is in its most perfect state of realization when it thus dwells and lives in supernatural realities—amidst *mysterious sacramental* truths. The charge of mystery is very common at the present day, especially in reference to all inquiries into the nature of Christ and his Church. But there cannot well be a charge more inconsistent and absurd. The end of all knowledge, as well as its primary ground, must be mystery; for its process can never cease until it reaches that which is groundless.¹⁵ If at any stage of its progress it can define the position which it has reached, that definition becomes a ground back of the position itself; and knowledge can never be said to be complete until it reaches the

¹⁴ We cannot forbear quoting Novatian upon this point, as we shall have occasion to refer to him hereafter. In his work de Trinitate, cap. xxiii, he writes: "Quoniam si ad hominem veniebat ut mediator Dei et hominum esse deberet, oportuit illum cum eo esse et verbum carnem fieri ut in semetipso concordiam confabularet terrenorum pariter atque coelestium, dum utriusque partis in se connectens pignora et Deum homini et hominem Deo copularet, ut merito Filius Dei per assumptionem Carnis Filius hominis, et Filius hominis per receptionem Dei Verbi Filius Dei effici possit. Hoc altissimum atque reconditum sacramentum ad salutem generis humani ante sæcula destinatum in Domino Jesu Christo Deo et homini invenitur impleri, quo conditio generis humani ad fructum æternæ salutis posset adduci" (Patrologiæ Cursus Comp. Tom. iii. p. 993).

¹⁵ Coleridge has a similar thought in his "Aids to Reflection."

ultimate ground, which from the nature of the case must be a mystery, a true *sacrament* to the mind. Every rational research must start in this acknowledgment; for there is no possibility of going from nature up to God through purely natural means. Every natural faculty is firmly fixed in earth, though pointing to heaven; and our communion with the supernatural must be by the exercise of that which is *itself* supernatural. If knowledge then be based upon that which is beyond itself, we are not to disregard its claim upon our attention; for its basis is only mysterious, because it is *absolute and real*. The same is the case with every possible department of human activity. In philosophy, the highest sphere of thought, we have the same necessary limitation. It can never pass beyond the Church's consciousness of Christ's person. This must ever be the measure of its truth and progress; for its ultimate aim is to reach the true relation and reconciliation of the finite and infinite, and here only can this relation and reconciliation be reached. "Christ is the truth."¹⁰ Wherever you commence, every thing earthly points to the heavenly. The world gathered up in humanity has ever hungered for that bread which was to give it life, and in every act of its existence has manifested its longings for supernatural aid. Even the whole choir of heaven, earth and hades, proclaim with one accord, that the incarnation is the great mystery, the central sacrament of the universe. The whole history of the ante-christian world, taking into its constitution Paganism as well as Judaism, tended to this very point; not indeed as the *result* of its own tendencies, or the fruit of its own process, but as the introduction of a new life and dispensation from above, responding however in every respect to the deepest wants and absolute necessities of the race. The Word became flesh, and not vice versa, although Judaism with its law and prophecy, and Paganism with its plastic polythism and refined culture, were clearly preparatory to it. All Christian history also, (we cannot say post-christian, for with much significance time is now reckoned Anno Domini, and not Anno post Dominum,) receives its meaning only in the conscious reception on the part of the world of the Christ-life of the incarnation. This is the animating soul of all history and development.

¹⁰ There is no possibility of separating philosophy from revelation in this sense. Christ is the way through which alone we can enter the infinite world of spirit. He is the truth also, as having reconciled being and phenomena, by completely uniting in himself the finite and infinite, so that the world of nature also is interpreted by Him.

If then we are to find in the incarnation, the character-giving and the life-giving type of all processes; if here the *history* of philosophy must stop her progress, and if found contradictory retrace her steps, and by the glorious light of this revelation correct her error; if here also the *philosophy* of history must finally rest in its full realization, when the heavens and the earth shall become new, why fix the sneering title of mysterious speculative theorizing upon all attempts to *consciously* pass along in the economy of God, or why with stopped ears and blinded eyes foolishly not listen to the voice of both heaven and earth announcing and pronouncing in every syllable they utter, along the track of ages, the *Word of God*, or refuse to look even through a glass darkly at that sun of righteousness, which lighteth the world. Faith, of course, must precede knowledge in this case, as in every other; yet not in the sense of emptying knowledge of its contents, but of elevating it into its own region of clearer intuition. As apprehended by faith, the mystery of the incarnation must ever remain the same; for its revelation is *in us* and *not to us*; but when applied to bring out more clearly the true nature of Christianity and the Church, great differences arise, and often although perhaps unconsciously its central force is pushed out of view and even utterly disregarded. Just here shall we find that the two roads divide, the one leading in the way of Church skepticism, the other in the way of Church faith; the one acknowledging no permanent force in the incarnation, and hence no supernatural powers or life in the Church, the other on the contrary recognizing her as the living and actual embodiment of this life, and the only continuation of this force.

Thus the doctrine of the incarnation becomes of great importance as a test in reference to Church orthodoxy, and therefore of vast influence upon all the practical operations of Christianity; for only so far as we can recognize the living connection between the incarnation and the Church, can we enter into the mysterious depth of Christian faith, or feel the powers of the life to come, operating within us and around us.

We should do great injustice to the subject in hand, were we not to mention the great practical importance which was attached to a correct view of Christ's person by the early Church. Upon this point she was peculiarly sensitive, and in the extreme caution with which she moved, as well as in the truly wonderful power with which she assimilated and took into her life that which was congenial and rejected that which was foreign, we have the clearest evidence of the divinity of her constitution, and the organizing and conserving power of the life she bears.

From the very earliest age of her existence, onward through persecutions, martyrdoms and triumphs, up to the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, Christ's person continued to be almost the sole test of heresy and orthodoxy. Saint Ignatius, as well as his divinely inspired master Saint John, makes mention of it always in this way. In his Epistle to the Ephesians, he calls those who carry about the name of Christ in deceit, wild beasts and rabid dogs, which bite in secret.¹⁷ So in his Epistle to the Trallians, he calls those atheists, referring to the Docetae, who say that Christ only suffered in appearance (το δοκεῖν πικνοθῆναι), and exhorts his brethren to flee these evil shoots, that bear death-bearing fruit (τας κακας παραφραδας, τας γεννωσας καρπον θανατηφορον);¹⁸ and again still more pointedly and severely in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, he declares that he who denies that Christ bore flesh (παρκοφορος) himself bears but his own corpse (νεκροφορος), and in the same connection goes so far even as to say that "the celestial and the glory of angels and those ruling both visible and invisible, if they do not believe in the blood of Christ, even to them there is condemnation."¹⁹ Polycarp speaks in the same style, according to Irenaeus,²⁰ calling Marcion "the first born of Satan," and employs the same expression in writing to the Philippians. Justin Martyr also is very careful throughout the whole of his first Apology to keep in distinct view the person of Christ, plainly considering a refusal to acknowledge his divinity a heresy of the most vital consequence (First Apol. c. 6 16, 31, 77, 79, 82, 83, 85, &c., &c.). It is needless to accumulate quotations from writers beyond Justin, upon a point so plain as this. The vast christological struggles of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, all show as clearly as history can show, that the doctrine of Christ's person was the most vital and practical one in the whole range of Christian

¹⁷ εὐδοκῶσι γὰρ τινες δόλῳ ποιῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν . . . οὓς δεῖ νῦν ὡς θῆρια ἐκκλίπειν, εἰσὶν γὰρ κύνες λυσσωντες λαθροδῆπται (Epist. ad Ephes. c. vii), "το ὄνομα," as Irenaeus remarks, "is used absolutely for the name of Christ," and in this absolute use of it we can see that it was emphatically the name.

¹⁸ Epist. ad Trall. x and xi.

¹⁹ Epist. ad Smyr. v and vi.

²⁰ Irenaeus, after having given an account of Saint John's meeting with Cerinthus writes thus: "et ipse autem Polycarpus Marcioni aliquando occurrenti sibi, et dicenti, Cognosce nos? respondit, Cognosco te primogenitum Satanae," and then adds this remarkable sentence: "Tantum Apostoli et horum discipuli habuerunt timorem, ut neque verbotenus communicarent alicui eorum qui adulaverant veritatem" (Iren. adv. haer. Lib. iii, cap. iii).

Theology. Upon this central point were all the energies of the church exerted. She was assailed, from within and from without; yet she stood firm to the declaration of the Apostle: "Great is the mystery of Godliness—God manifest in the flesh," and finally obtained a triumphant victory.

Irenaeus, whom Tertullian calls "the most diligent searcher of all doctrines," and whom Theodoret calls the "light of the Western Gauls;" Origen; Cyprian; Dionysius Alexander, "doctor of the Catholic Church," according to Athanasius; Gregory the wonder-worker, with his more wonderful Trinitarian Creed, which Gregory Nyssa calls so powerful an antidote for Arian and Semi-Arian heresies;" were all enlisted in the third century in the struggle, and fought manfully, but only to prepare the way for the more vehement and earnest contest which was to come, and for which the church brought forth a still larger and still nobler band of heroes. It is but extreme ignorance, and merely blind historical skepticism, to set down these life struggles of the early church as mere theoretical speculations, which did but prepare the way for the church's still wider apostacy. Unitarians, and extremely one sided unhistorical Protestants, (to the shame of Protestantism there are many such in her communion), may if they choose entirely disregard the results of these struggles, through fear of *traditionary faith*; and may pour as much contempt as they please upon the barbarous, and as they say meaningless terms, used in defining that which from its nature must ever be mysteriously undefinable; yet they cannot refuse to acknowledge the intense earnestness of the struggles themselves, and that the Church, although according to them the kingdom of Satan, *strangely* felt that her very life was dependent upon the issue. No one can possibly enter into the true spirit of these controversies, without feeling the awful grandeur which surrounds him; whether that grandeur be the wild sport of the prince of darkness, or the awfully mysterious brooding of the Holy Spirit over the struggling and almost prostrate body of the Redeemer.

We come now to inquire what were the peculiar views in regard to the doctrine under examination, to which the Church in her earliest age was so sensitively attached, and for which, as she advanced in years, she so strenuously and successfully contended; and also to inquire what practical bearing they have in reference to a correct idea of the Church and Christianity.

" See Butler's *Lives of the Saints*.

The point we propose to reach, is, as we have already remarked, this: *The organic union of the distinctly human and divine in the person of Christ as the central point in which Christianity receives its full force and distinctive character, and where the Church therefore must look for its type and contents.*

Let our inquiry commence with the venerable martyr of Antioch.

*Saint Ignatius.**

Nothing is known concerning the parents of Ignatius. Some have supposed that he was the child whom Christ took up in his arms, because he so invariably applied to himself the title Θεοφορος. But his reply to Trajan rather contradicts this supposition, giving to the title its usual signification, God-bearer. Chrysostom distinctly asserts moreover that he never saw Jesus. There have been many different conjectures as to his birth place and country, some supposing him to have been a Syrian rather than a Grecian; others that he was born in Sardinia or Phrygia. It is the tradition that he was the disciple of the Apostle John. Be this as it may, it is clearly evident from his writings and the acts of his martyrdom, that he was a man remarkable for his ardent and devoted piety and his overflowing Christian-love. So highly was he esteemed by his brethren and the Apostles, that he was ordained to the important office of bishop of Anti-

* We purposely omit Clement of Rome, as we do not wish at present to examine the objections that have been brought against him upon this point. In our opinion, however, he distinctly asserts the divinity of Christ, and without going through his Epistles in support of this position, we shall transcribe Rev. T. Chevalier's note upon the same point, which is appended to his translation of Clement's first Epistle to the Corinthians. "Thus in c. 2 of this Epistle, we find the words—τοῖς ἐσθλοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρροῦμενοι, καὶ προσέχοντες τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ ἐκκενῶς, ἀντιρριζωμένοι ἢ τοῖς σπλάγχνοις καὶ τα πάθηματι αὐτοῦ ἢ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν (Compare Acts ix, 23, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν περιτομῇ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος). In c. 36, Clement denominates Christ, ἀναγκαῖον τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ (Θεοῦ). In c. 32, he thus distinguishes the divine nature of Christ from his human nature: ἐξ αὐτοῦ (Ἰερουλ) ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς, τὸ κατὰ σὰρκα (compare Romans ix. 5). And in the passage above c. 10, Clement expressly says of Christ, perhaps with an allusion to Phil ii. 5-8, Το σκεπτόν τῆς μεγαλωσύνης τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἔβλεν ἐν ἀκνω ἀλαζονείας, οὐδὲ υπερφάνειας, κατὰ δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ ταπεινόφροναν." See Bishop Bull, Defensio Fid. Nicæn. sec. ii. c. 3. His second Epistle is much more distinct than the one just noticed, and will be sufficiently conclusive to any one that will read it. Its introduction is, Ἀδελφοί, σπουδὴ δὲ ἡμᾶς φρεσὶν κατὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστὸν ὡς περὶ Θεοῦ, ὡς περὶ κριτοῦ ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν.

och, the central city of Syria. Some following the Apostolic Constitutions say, that he was ordained by Saint Paul in connection with Evodius who was ordained by Saint Peter: others say that he was ordained by John the evangelist. Eusebius states that he succeeded Evodius, and Theodoret, that he immediately succeeded Saint Peter. It is most probable however that he became bishop of Antioch on the death of Evodius, being ordained by one of the Apostles then living. His zeal and fidelity were remarkable, gaining him the reputation of being a "man in all things like the Apostles." In his Christian watchfulness over his flock, he is represented as one "who, like a good pilot by the helm of prayer and fasting, and by the constancy of teaching, and by spiritual earnestness (*τῷ τῶν πνευματικῶν*), held out against the storms that beat against him, lest he should lose any of those who were of little courage and simple,"* and in the same connection, in the acts of his martyrdom, the power of his instruction is thus highly extolled: "Wherefore remaining for a few years longer in the Church, and as a *divine lamp* illuminating (*λαμπρὸν διαφνέον φωτισμὸν*) the understanding of each one through his exegesis of the Scriptures, he obtained the end of his prayer, (referring to his martyrdom, which he very much desired and even prayed for, that thus he might be brought into closer and more intimate union with the Lord). His eminent Christian zeal and fidelity, in the age of persecution, marked him out as one that must seal the truth of his doctrines and faith with his own blood, and in the ninth year of the reign of Trajan, who, elated with his recent Scythian and Dacian conquests, commenced a bitter persecution against the Christians, he was thrown to the wild beasts in the Amphitheatre at Rome. Many instead of placing the time of his martyrdom in the year 107, the ninth year of Trajan's reign, have given it a some what later date, 115 and 116. The latter is probably the most correct. His journey from Antioch to Rome, the scene of his greatest sufferings and triumph, tedious and degrading as it was, was converted by the power of his faith into a triumphal entrance into that kingdom where martyrdom was the *crown*, and chains and bonds the *jewels*. His progress is very fully described in the acts of his martyrdom. First from Antioch to Seleucia, thence with a very troublesome voyage to Smyrna, where with unspeakable joy he met his fellow disciple Saint Polycarp, bishop of the Church at this place, and also the bishops, presby-

* Martyrium S. Igna. c. 1.

ters and deacons, of the other Asiatic Churches, who had come to visit him in his bonds. He desired not to stay with them however, but earnestly entreated the holy Polycarp to pray that "quickly disappearing from earth by wild beasts, he might appear before the face of Christ." While at Smyrna, he sent letters to the churches, through the officers they had sent to visit him, "distilling spiritual grace with prayer and exhortation," and also one to the Romans, to prepare the way for his death, which from the beginning to the end is filled with true Ignatian fire and spirit. From Smyrna he set sail and came to Troas; where he wrote to the churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia, and also to Polycarp. From Troas he went to Neapolis; thence over the Adriatic into the Tyrrhene sea; and finally entered the Roman port, rejoicing in the very jaws of death, that he was thought worthy to die for Christ. He was immediately thrown to the wild beasts, and devoured. But so sacred was he in the esteem of the church, "that the more solid parts of his body which remained were carried to Antioch, and put down in lime, as an inestimable treasure, left to the holy church by the grace which was in the Martyr."³ The same burning devotion, and the same Christian meekness, which were manifest in his acts, also predominantly display themselves in all his writings. Especially noticeable is his abounding love, and his exalted view of the supernatural *significancy* of the *Christian ministry* and the *Christian church*. This latter comes out with *remarkable prominence* in every Epistle, and indeed in almost every paragraph. Love and respect your Bishop as Christ, is ever upon his tongue, and, Be ye united as one single body under one single visible head, seems to be the strong under current in all his writings.⁴ But we have digressed already too long, and must

³ Μόνα γὰρ τὰ τραχύτερα τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ λεψάνων περιλειφθῆναι, αὐτὰ εἰς τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ἀποκομισθῆναι, καὶ ἐν λίμῃ κατατεθῆναι, θραύρος ἀτιμῆτος ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ μαρτυρίῳ χάριτος τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ καταλειφθέντα (Martyr. S. Igna. c. vi). This is spoken of also by Chrysostom.

⁴ Any one that will take the pains to read any of the Epistles of Ignatius, cannot fail to be struck with the *peculiar force* of his exalted views of the ministry, and indeed of every thing connected with the church; and at the same time also with his entire absence and negation of that spirit of independency, and private creed-making, which is now so lamentably prevalent. His *abhorrence* of any thing like division and schism is *instinctive*. This naturally grows out of his conception of Church Catholicity. With him, the church is not one in the way of sympathy, but in the way of a *fraternal and visible organism*. Every form of her existence must be the full reflex of the supernatural power and the living unity of her inward constitution; and the authority she possesses as the objective bearer of the life of Christ,

turn to his Epistles and examine the weight of his testimony upon the doctrine of Christ's person, this being the point which we have more directly in view.

We do not expect of course to find in his epistles any logical or scientific presentation of the doctrine in question; for these early fathers, as Saint Cyprian has well remarked, "knew better how to die than to dispute." The period in which they lived was not one of doctrinal precision and scientific definiteness, but of persecutions and trials, of internal strugglings and new unfolding life; and even the outward circumstances under which Ignatius wrote, if there were nothing else, rendered it almost impossible that this should be the case. His own church, very near to his heart, was without a bishop, (a matter of *peculiar* concern to Ignatius,) and persecutions were springing up on every side; and his mind was also continually absorbed in the approaching glories of his martyrdom. Notwithstanding all these conflicting circumstances, so important was the Redeemer to his faith, that every thing is made to centre around his person. In the very presence of the emperor himself, he rejoices to confess one God and one Christ, and in every single epistle we have a full recognition of the divine and human nature of Christ, although most frequently in a general way. Also that same *instinctive* severity against every heresy that touches in the least the mystery of the incarnation, which, as we have before said, was the peculiar characteristic of that period, ever manifests itself; and the unity and authority of the church is ever enforced and illustrated by a reference to the Trinity, as being involved however in a single visible representation, in the bishop, presbyters and deacons. "Without these there is no church." As we have already said, Ignatius speaks in a general way in reference to the constitution of Christ's person, yet this very fact itself, and the perfect consciousness which he seems to have that he is broaching no new doctrine, which can meet with the least objection on the part of any of the churches to which he was writing, together with the bitter reproach which

must with him exist in some single functionary representative (or representatives). This is at least the tendency of his whole tone of thought. It is no more than just in this connection to say, that he is in most respects *heterodox*, if judged from a Puritan stand-point, and also that there is in fact scarcely a face in the polyhedral mirror of Protestantism, from which the image of this worthy disciple of the beloved John can be reflected, without woful distortions. To him emphatically the sect system would be the abomination of abominations.

he ever casts upon those that hold different opinions, all instead of arguing against the position which we have laid down, (viz. that Ignatius distinctly asserts the humanity and divinity of Christ,) are strongly in its favor; showing at least, that it was the faith which the church lived, if not that which it logically defined.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians this position can be recognized from the very beginning to the end. His introduction is to the church at Ephesus, united through the will of the Father and Jesus Christ, our God (τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν), wishing it much happiness in Jesus Christ and his spotless grace." The connection between the Father and Jesus Christ, made still more binding by the explanative clause "τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν," which refers with equal force to both, evidently grows out of the consciousness of their equality and co-operation. In c. 1, he speaks of their having been "rekindled into life by the blood of God" (ἀναζωοψυχώσας ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ). In c. 2, he tells them that they should "glorify Christ who has glorified them;" (the worship of Christ and the view of the sacraments are perhaps the strongest and most satisfactory evidence, that this early period of the church affords, of the divinity and humanity of Christ). In c. 3, he calls Christ "our inseparable life" (τοῦ ἀδιαχωρίτου ἡμῶν ζῆν). There cannot well be in any language a more forcible expression than this, to denote our union with Christ and its vivific force. The very position and nature of the words denote it—"ἀδιαχωρίτου ἡμῶν" coming between the article τοῦ and ζῆν makes it of necessity a qualification of the latter, and ζῆν connected with the article becomes a verbal noun, signifying the moving principle of life, the "the to live" of the Christian. In c. 4, (the passage is so beautiful, and withal such a powerful comment upon modern independency and sectarianism, as to warrant us in quoting it entire) he writes: "It is becoming you to turn in with the opinion of your bishop, which also ye do. For your renowned presbytery, worthy of God, has been so fitted to the bishop as chords to a harp. Wherefore in your unanimity and harmonious love *Jesus Christ* is sung; and man to man ye make up the chorus, that, being harmonious in concord and having taken up the melody of God, in oneness ye may sing in one voice, through Jesus Christ, to the Father; that he may hear you, at the same time also recognizing by your well-doing that ye are *members of his Son*. It is useful that ye should be in unblameable unity, that ye may also participate of God." In c. 5, he speaks of the Ephesians being "joined to their bishop as the church to Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ to the Father, that

all may be harmonious in *unity*;" and thus exhorts them saying; "Let no one be deceived. If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God." This seems to be as it were a satire upon the modern church skepticism and mode of thought, which recognizes no living and visible unity in the church, and no direct communication of her supernatural life to her members. In c. 6, he says, fearing the baneful influence of those heresies which were already springing up, outside and inside the church, "Hear ye nothing farther than Jesus Christ, who speaks in truth;" and then continues in c. 7, evidently presenting the true doctrine which these heresies denied: "One physician there is, carnal and spiritual, born and unborn, God existing in the flesh, both from Mary and from God, first possible and then impassible."⁶ In c. 9, he calls his brethren "stones of the temple of the Father prepared for the building of God the Father, raised on high by the machine of Jesus Christ which is the cross, using for a cord the Holy Spirit, their faith being their leader, and love the road leading Godward;" and in the same connection thus exhorts them: "Εστε ουν και συνοδοι

⁶ Εἰς ἑαυτὸς ἐστίν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός γενήτος καὶ ἀγενήτος; (a) ἐν σαρκὶ γενήτος θεός, ἐν θανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινή (b) καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ πρῶτον πάθητος καὶ τότε ἀπαθής (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν (c).—(a) Many read in place of "γενήτος καὶ ἀγενήτος," "γενήτος καὶ ἀγενήτης," yet after all in the general use of these words there is no difference in their meaning. They evidently spring from the same root and can have the same general signification, although after the Council of Nice an important distinction was made between them, which was scrupulously observed. Bishop Bull (*Defensio Fid. Nic.* cap. 2, 5, 6,) translates the words "create and uncreate," although he reads *γενήτος; καὶ ἀγενήτος;* and Athanasius evidently understood Ignatius to hold in these words that Christ was man and God, for he quotes thence for this very purpose: "πεπεισμεθα ὅτι καὶ ὁ μακάριος Ἰγνατίος ὀρθῶς γράφει, γενήτον αὐτὸν λέγων διὰ τὴν σάρκα· ὁ γὰρ Χριστὸς σαρκὶ ἐγένετο· ἀγενήτον δὲ, ὅτι μὴ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ γνητῶν ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οὗτος ἐκ πατρὸς (Athan. de synodis, as quoted by Rev. Chevalier). Theodoret reads *γενήτος ἐξ ἀγενήτου*. Tertullian from the similarity of thought and language evidently refers to this passage when he writes (*de Carne Christi*, cap. 5): "Ita utriusque substantiæ census hominem et Deum exhibuit: hinc natum, inde non natum; hinc carneum, inde spiritalem; hinc infirmum, inde praeferentem; hinc morientem, inde viventem. Quae proprietates conditionum, divinae et humanae, aequa utique naturae utriusque veritate dispuncta est, eadem fide et spiritus et carnis.—(b) "In death true life." The great probability is that *θανάτω* is correct and *ἀθανάτω* incorrect; for it would be difficult if not impossible to give any meaning to the passage whatever, by retaining *ἀθανάτω*, while by substituting *θανάτω* it would be very forcible and consistent.—(c) These words are in the passage as quoted by Theodoret in the fifth century, and also in the old Latin version (See Rev. T. Chevalier's note upon this passage, in his translation of this Epistle).

πάντες θεοφοροὶ καὶ ναοφοροὶ, χριστοφοροὶ, ἀγιοφοροὶ, κατὰ πάντα κινούμενοι ἐν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.” In c. 17, he writes: “For this cause did the Lord receive ointment upon his head, that he might breathe into the church incorruptibility.” In c. 18, thus: “For our God Jesus Christ was born in the womb of Mary, according to the economy of God, from the seed of David, but of the Holy Ghost.* Who was born and baptized, that by suffering he might purify water.” In c. 20, he speaks of an economy “εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ἀνθρώπων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,” and concludes by gathering all the redemptive force of the incarnation into the Lord’s Supper, as the central source of life and ground of unity: “Since ye all individually come together through grace in one faith and one Jesus Christ, who was from the race of David according to the flesh, the Son of man and the Son of God . . . breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, the antidote that we shall not die but live in Christ forever.” In c. 21, he concludes his Epistle, as he commenced, in God the Father and the Son, saying: “Farewell (εἰρωσθε, more properly perhaps *be ye strong* from *ρῶννυμι*) in God the Father and in Jesus Christ our common hope” (τῇ κοινῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν).

We have thus given somewhat minutely the language of Saint Ignatius in reference to the person of Christ, as found in his Epistle to the Ephesians. It is evident from the quotations which we have made that Ignatius, whatever may be his meaning, truly represents the faith of the church at that time. The whole style of his writing flows from a consciousness, that he is the true exponent of her life, and sometimes he even places himself in the position of her spiritual teacher. It is absolutely absurd to imagine that he was a heretic in her bosom, or that as “Shepherd of Syria” he misrepresented her doctrines. With the same propriety, and with as much truth, might one term Washington a Tory. It might be well to examine here, more closely than we have, his view of the church in connection with the doctrine in hand, being so intimately connected as they are; but this will come in more properly hereafter, where we make an application in this way of the doctrine, as more clearly and fully brought to view by subsequent writers.

It must not be supposed, that this single Epistle is the only

* ἐκ οὐρανοῦ; ἢ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, πνεύματος δὲ ἁγίου. In this sentence the particle *ἢ* anticipates a possible wrong construction, the possibility of which is removed by the answering particle *δε*. The first assertion would be incomplete without the second, and hence the passage in its grammatical structure is a strong evidence in our favor.

source from which we can determine what position Ignatius held; for it is perhaps less explicit than any of his other Epistles. In his short Epistle to the Magnesians, there is the same full and even fuller flow of testimony, the same absolute horror of any thing like division, and the same peculiar view of church authority and *representative* unity. The church must be *solidly one*. He addresses the letter to the Magnesians, more immediately for the purpose of recommending to them unity among themselves, and subjection to their bishop, who as it appears was quite young, (this forms the substance of the letter); yet he continually refers to the person of Christ as the ground of this unity and obedience, for as he says, "the unity in them is both of the *body* and *spirit* of Jesus Christ, our eternal life (*εν αις ενωσιν ενωμαι σωματος και πνευματος Ιησου Χριστου, του διαπατος ημων ζην*). A few extracts from this Epistle must suffice. In c. 7, after earnestly exhorting them "to come together in one place and to have one prayer, one supplication, one mind, and one hope," he says: "There is one Jesus Christ, than whom there is nothing better. Come together therefore all of you as to one temple of God, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from one father, being and abiding in one (*και εις ενα οντα και χωρησαντα*). It is plain to be seen, that this passage grew out of the previous exhortation in the same paragraph, which in its tone of thought is peculiarly Ignatian, and at the same time peculiarly unpuritanical, viz, "*Μηδε πειρασθε ενλογον τε φαινεσθαι ιδια υμιν*." In c. 8, after guarding them against strange doctrines, and mentioning that the Holy Prophets lived according to Christ, he calls Him "the eternal Word of God, not proceeding from silence (*λογος αιδιος ουκ απο σιγης*);" and near the conclusion of the letter he recommends them "to advance to a full knowledge (*πεπληροφορησθαι*) in the birth, suffering, and resurrection, which happened in the time of the government of Pontius Pilate."

In all the other Epistles of Ignatius, the same view of Christ's person is sustained. In his Epistle to the Trallians, he very distinctly and emphatically asserts the humanity of Christ in these words: "Stop your ears therefore when any one speaks to you separate from Christ, who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary, who was truly born, and both ate and drank, and was truly crucified and died, those in heaven and upon earth and under the earth witnessing it, and who truly rose from the

* Whatever reference may be given to "*ουκ απο σιγης*," the clause clearly recognizes the absolute eternity of Christ as the Son of God.

dead."* So also in c. 11 of the same Epistle, he is equally plain in reference to his divinity, saying that "God has promised a union which is himself (*οὐ δύναται οὐν κεφαλὴ χωρὶς γεννηθῆναι ἀπὸ μητρὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκωσιν ἐπαγγελλομένου, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτός*)."

The same is the case with his Epistle to the Romans, in which the whole ardor and devotion of his soul, and the glorious triumph of his faith over the gloomy prospect of an excruciating death, beautifully and glowingly portray themselves. This letter, as we have already remarked, was written at Smyrna to the church at Rome, to prepare the way for his martyrdom; for he seems to have had some fears, that through their intercession he might lose the privilege of sealing his confession of Christ with his own blood. It *may be* from this fact that he commences it as he does; or it may be perhaps from the central position that Rome then held in the political world; yet what ever may have been the cause, he warmly rejoices in her *pre-eminent* worth, and adorns her in the language of his introduction with a complete wreath of emphatic adjectives, (*ἀξιοθίτος, ἀξιοπρεπής, αξιομακάριστος, ἀξιόκαιρος, ἀξιόπιστος, ἀξιοπαινετός, ἀξιοῦχος καὶ προαυξημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, χριστιανικός, πατριανικός*). Throughout the whole of this letter, his mind is completely absorbed, and raised above earth and suffering, with the prospect of meeting with Christ through his own martyrdom. "Permit me," he writes in c. 4 with intense earnestness, "to be the food of wild beasts, through whom I can meet with God. I am the wheat of God, and by the teeth of wild beasts I shall be ground, so that I shall be found the pure bread of Christ;" and in the same connection a little farther on: "If I shall suffer, I shall be the freedman of Christ, and shall rise again free in him;" and again in c. 5, (it is impossible

* Κωφώθητε οὐκ, ὅταν ἦμι χωρὶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ λαλῇ τις, τοῦ ἐκ γενεῆς Δαβὶδ, τοῦ ἐκ Μαρίας, ὃς ἀληθῶς ἐγεννηθῇ, ἐφαγεν τε καὶ ἐπικεν, ἀληθῶς ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Ἡορτίου Πιλάτου, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν. . . . ὁ χωρὶς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν (Ep. ad Trall. c. IX). This is evidently written to oppose those who denied the real humanity of Christ, as may be seen from what follows it, in the next paragraph; where he gives the title of atheists to those, who believe that Christ was only man in appearance. The same argument is used by Tertullian, in support of the same position. "Natus est Dei Filius: non pudet, quia pudendum est; et mortuus est Dei Filius: prorsus credibile est, quia ineptum est; et sepultus resurrexit: certum est, quia impossibile est. Sed hæc quomodo in illo vera erunt, si ipse non fuit verus, si non vere haberit in se quod ageretur, quod moreretur, quod sepeliretur et resuscitaretur: carnem scilicet hanc, sanguine suffusam, ossibus substractam, nervis intextam, venis implexam" (Tertull. de Carn. Christi. c. 5, as quoted by Hooker).

to imagine a more sublime picture of Christian heroism): "Let nothing visible or invisible envy me, that I attain unto Christ. Let fire and the cross, herds of wild beasts, lacerations, rendings, scatterings of bones, tearing off of limbs, manglings of the whole body and the evil torments of the devil come upon me, only that I may meet with Jesus Christ." In c. 7 also, the whole ardor and heavenly fire of his soul bursts forth in burning, winged words: "My love is crucified, and there is in me no matter-loving fire, but water living and speaking in me, saying from within, Hither to the Father. I delight not in the nourishment of corruption nor in the pleasures of this life. The bread of God I wish, that heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was born in this last time of the seed of David and Abraham: and the drink of God I wish, his blood, which is incorruptible love and yearless life."

The same entire consecration to Christ manifests itself in his Epistle to the Philadelphians and to Polycarp. Christ ever appears as the sum and substance of his faith; not as divine only, and operating by mere spiritual influence, but as human; thus making it possible for him to be inserted into his body and flesh. This especially presents itself in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, a single passage of which only we shall quote. C. 1: "I glorify Jesus Christ, who is God, who thus has made you wise. For I have perceived that you are cemented in immovable faith, being nailed as it were to the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, both in body and spirit, and being grounded in love in the blood of Christ; being fully instructed in our Lord, as to his being truly from the seed of David according to the flesh, and the Son of God according to the will and power of God; as to his being truly born from the Virgin and baptized by John, in order that he might fulfil all righteousness; as to his being truly nailed for us, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, in the flesh. By which fruit we are by His most blessed suffering that we may set up with him a token for all ages, through the resurrection, for the holy and faithful followers of him, whether among the Jews or Gentiles, in one body of his church." These quotations must suffice to show the spirit and doctrine of this noble martyr.

It has not been our design to enter into a critical examination of the terms employed by Ignatius in reference to the person of Christ, but only to show that there is no necessary contradiction between his own position and that of the church as more positively defined afterwards; and by the way it is entirely wrong, to isolate his position from that of the church afterward, for eve-

ry grade of development more clearly defines that which precedes it and upon which it is based. We have admitted already that his language lacks that doctrinal precision which was afterwards employed, but this does not prove by any means that his *faith* lacked contents; for how could it have been otherwise? Christianity in its scientific aspect is not a merely dead system of doctrines and formulas, the same yesterday to-day and forever in its form and apprehension, but is in its very nature historical. In its own progress do its contents, on the part of the church, become more clearly apprehended by the understanding, and thus become capable of being more clearly defined in the way of doctrine. The leaf of the plant, for example, is at first scarcely *characterized* to the general observation, and it is only in its full development that all of its parts are fully understood in their mutual relations, for then only can the whole process of its growth be placed before the mind. So in the church. The normative ground of all doctrine lies in the written word; but not yet has the church fully developed its own doctrinal life; for from the nature of the case, this can only go along with her *universal* development. Creeds are not the product of superstition, nor mechanical guides to direct the ignorant, but are the full living presentation of the objective realities of faith. They guide, yet freely, for we can only be led by them as we enter into their inner sanctuary of meaning, and then we do not follow them, but lay hold of them, and live in them; and find, although they stand immoveably fixed, that they have a wondrous history, and a mysterious power. Our point then has been to show by quotations, that the divinity and humanity of Christ was an essential *article of the faith* of Ignatius, and that it was the necessary *pre-position* in all that he has written. There is not a single quotation which we have made, that would not be almost entirely unintelligible from a Docetic or Ebionitic standpoint. Thus much in reference to the christology of Ignatius. In another place we shall examine its bearing upon the church. In conclusion we would say, that the mysterious force and depth of Ignatius' faith in the supernatural character and power of the church and all its offices, deriving them directly from the person of Christ, out of whose permanent presence they are made to flow, (οπου αν παρη ο επισκοπος, εκει το πληθος εστω' ωσπερ οπου αν η Χριστος Ιησους, εκει η καθολικη εκκλησια; Ep. ad Smyrn. c. viii.) has been so novel and strange to our Protestant-trained tone of thought, that we have lingered with him, forgetting for the time entirely the venerable Polycarp, to whom in our next, together with Justin Martyr, we shall turn our attention.

H.

EVANGELICAL RADICALISM.

THE CHURCH MEMBER'S MANUAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL PRINCIPLES, DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE: *Presenting a systematic view of the structure, polity, doctrines, and practices of Christian Churches, as taught in the Scriptures.* By WILLIAM CROWELL, &c. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1852.

A truly interesting and suggestive book—though not exactly in the way of its own intention. The author is a Baptist, who proposes to set forth a scheme of the Church to suit the rationalistic standpoint of his own sect; “his only desire being to follow truth, wherever it may lead.” To answer the question, “What and where is the church?” he scorns the thought of taking counsel of the Church itself. “I might as well go to Delphi or Dodona,” he tells us, “or the shrine of Jupiter Ammon, to inquire who is the god, and where is his temple.” Pagan and Christian theocracies, it seems, are alike without truth and entitled to no trust. The whole appeal must be “to the Bible;” which means, of course, to the Bible as read by William Crowell and his Baptist brethren, in distinction from the reading of Presbyterians, Lutherans, &c., &c., as well as from the sense attached to it by the ancient Fathers and the Catholic Church of all past ages. “Hitherto Baptists have paid but little attention to the subject of church polity;” too busy with the interests of “*spiritual Christianity in its primitive form*,” to give much attention to any such outward concern. We will not pretend here to go minutely into the theory now concocted out of the Bible, for their special accommodation and use, by this *Church Member's Manual*. Suffice it to say, that it is pre-eminently rationalistic. The idea of a general church, save in the sense of a mere abstraction, is discarded; the only true order in the case, is that of *many distinct churches*, each perfectly original and independent in its own sphere. A church thus is simply an association of believers, who join together in this way for their common advantage in the Christian life, under the pledge of baptism. “Men have a natural right to associate by mutual agreement for the accomplishment of any innocent or useful purpose. In this way civil government was first formed, and God owned the institution as one of his own appointment. The disciples of Christ have the right to unite themselves together in churches, for the promotion of their piety and the spread of the Gospel, unless he has forbidden them in his revealed word. This he has not done. It is, therefore

from the nature of the case, proper that men should unite in a mutual, voluntary covenant for religious purposes. The objects in view are more important than those attained in the civil compact, in which men unite in a mutual covenant for a common benefit; and the act is as reasonable and as necessary in itself."

—P. 55, 56. Every particular church, so formed by *social contract*, holds its powers directly and exclusively from Christ, who alone is head over all things to the churches, without the intervention of Pope, Bishop, or General Assembly. "Each one," as the celebrated Dr. Wayland dogmatizes the matter, "is a perfect and complete system. The decisions of one are not binding on another. Each one is at liberty to interpret the laws of Christ for itself, and to govern itself according to that interpretation. Each church is therefore as essentially independent of every other, as though each one were the only church in Christendom."—P. 80. So runs this *Bible* scheme of the Baptists. We have no room here to go into any close consideration of its merits. But it speaks for itself. Only think of Rousseau's theory of *social contract*, deliberately applied to the grand and glorious mystery of the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The scheme is completely at war, it will be readily seen, with what was held to be Christianity in the first ages. Of this its patrons may not feel it necessary to make any account. Enough that they can pretend to have the Bible at all events on their side. Weighed against such authority, of what worth or force is Christian antiquity—even though it *should* reach back to the very age next following that of the Apostles? Still however the fact is one, which ought to be distinctly seen and acknowledged. Let it pass for what it may, it deserves to be fully understood and held up to view. This Baptist theory of Christianity is not what was held to be the "mystery of godliness," in the early church. Neither is the difference circumstantial only and accidental. It goes to the heart of religion. It has to do with its universal system. We have in the two cases actually two gospels, two altogether different versions of the Christian salvation. In one case, all rests on the Creed; in the other this fundamental symbol is charged with heresy and falsehood. In one case, the church is made to be supernatural, and is honored as the real medium of salvation to her children; in the other she is treated as a "figment" in every such view, and falls into the conception of a social contract. The ministry in one case holds its commission and its powers from God; in the other case it is the creature of man. In the one case, the sacraments are ~~means~~ and bearers of heavenly grace; in the other, they possess

no such mystic force whatever. The creed of the ancient church, this modern system openly turns into a lie. What all antiquity believed, it takes a pride in refusing to believe; and affects to be *spiritual*, by treating with contempt the real mystery of the Spirit's presence, in the only form in which it was to all Christian antiquity an object of faith. How can two such contrary systems be considered for one moment the same? They exclude each other. If one is to stand, the other must fall. Brought before the tribunal of this modern system, the ancient Christianity is found to be altogether wrong and false. We have only however to reverse the procedure, by bringing the modern system to the bar of the ancient, and at once the falsehood and wrong fall just as conclusively over to the other side. The two schemes are completely at issue. The contest between them is one of life and death. When the modern system challenges our faith, it asks us in fact to renounce all connection with the faith and religious life of the Church of the first ages. And so on the other hand if we feel it necessary to hold fast to the communion of this primitive piety—if we cannot bear the thought of giving up all spiritual fellowship with the martyrs, confessors, fathers and saints, of the early ages, and are not willing to set them all down for fanatics and fools—if we tremble to stigmatize the Christianity that conquered the Roman world as the invention of Satan, root and branch—we must not, and dare not, shrink from the responsibility of declaring the rationalistic unsacramental system now before us a dangerous delusion, which all who value the salvation of their souls are bound religiously to avoid. It would have been so regarded, beyond all controversy, by the universal church in the beginning. There would have been as little patience with it precisely, as there was with Gnosticism. It would have been branded openly as a virtual denial of the entire mystery of the Gospel. Of this, we say, there can be no doubt, and in regard to it there should be no equivocation or disguise.

Shall we be told then, that it is harsh to think and speak as we do of the religious system now under consideration, because it embraces a large amount of respectable Christian profession at the present time, and is nothing more in fact than the last phase of what is called orthodox Puritanism, which many hold to be the very perfection and *ne plus ultra* of evangelical religion? We reply by asking, How is it to be helped? We are shut up to a sore dilemma here, from which there is no possible escape. We must break with this modern Puritanic system, or else break with the whole Christianity of the first ages. No sophistry can

cause them to appear the same. The Creed of the one, is the Lie of the other. What was the mystery of godliness in the old church, this new faith unblushingly declares to be the mystery of iniquity. In such circumstances we have no choice, except to say with which of the two interests we hold it best to make common cause. To justify the one, is necessarily to condemn the other. To show respect towards this new faith, because it is outwardly respectable, must we cover with reproach and disgrace the old faith from the days of Polycarp and Ignatius to those of Ambrose and Augustine? Do we owe no respect also, and no charity, to the first Christian ages? What right indeed can those have to demand our tenderness and forbearance, in so grave a case, who make no account whatever of the reputation or credit of whole centuries of past Christian history, but modestly require us to set them all down as heretical and false over against themselves? What is the peculiar merit of this Baptistic Puritanism, a thing comparatively of yesterday, that it should be allowed thus to insult all Christian antiquity, and have full exemption at the same time from every unfavorable judgment upon its own pretensions and claims? "What!" we may well say to it in the language of St. Paul, "Came the word of God out from you; or came it unto you only?" Who art thou, upstart system! that thou shouldst set thyself in such proud style above the universal church of antiquity—the immediate successors of the Apostles, the noble army of martyrs, the goodly fellowship of the fathers, the vast cloud of witnesses that look down upon us from these ages of faith—charging it with wholesale superstition and folly, and requiring us to renounce its creed, the whole scheme and habit of its religious life, and to accept from *thy* hands, in place of it, another form of belief, another scheme of doctrine altogether, as infallibly true and right? Who gave thee this authority? Whence came such infallibility?

With immense self-complacency, the system lays its hand on the Bible, and says: This is my warrant. Aye, but who is to interpret this written revelation? *Reason*, replies the system. "The Bible is the church's supreme law, reason is her court. The Bible is the compass; reason, lighted by the Spirit of God, is the binnacle lamp." There we have it. Reason, every man's reason for himself, the world's private judgment and common sense with such religious illumination as it may come to in its own sphere, is the court, the tribunal, by which the law in this case is to take the form of truth and life. Is that not rationalism almost without disguise? What more could the worst radi-

calism ask or want? But for the present, let that pass. Baptist Puritanism appeals to the Bible. We now boldly deny, that it has the Bible on its side. This goes on the contrary full as much against its claims and pretensions throughout, as Christian antiquity itself. When it seems to have any part of the Bible in its favor, it is only by reading into it in the first place its own sense, by begging before hand the whole question in debate, by taking for granted what is to be proved, and by making its own rationalistic hypothesis in this way the standpoint from which is taken afterwards every observation of the Divine text. Even then the result is at best but a lame and forced construction. The New Testament is as far removed, as it well can be, from the Baptist and Independent habit of mind. It proceeds throughout on the assumption, that Christianity is a mystery, a constitution above nature, objectively at hand under a real historical form in the world, to which men must submit by faith in such view in order to be saved. This of itself involves the whole doctrine of the Church, with its Divine jurisdiction and heavenly powers, its ministry starting from Christ, its grace bearing sacraments, its unity and catholicity, the universal course of the new creation, we may say, as it is made to pass before us in the Creed. Only let the standpoint of this old faith be taken, in reading the Scriptures, the same that was occupied by the church in the beginning, and it will soon be found all that is needed, to expose the huge illusions of the Baptist exegesis, and to set the Bible before us in a wholly different light and sense.

And why should *not* this old standpoint be taken, when we thus approach the Bible? Why should we renounce the posture of faith in which the ancient church stood, and take, at the bidding of Puritanism, what must be considered as compared with it a posture of infidelity or no-faith, that we may be supposed to study God's word to purpose and effect? The absurdity of such a requirement is greater than can be easily expressed. Its most enormous presumption may well fill us with wonder and surprise.

J. W. N